617027

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_june-14-28-1900_84

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

SEVENTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

63 & 64 VICTORIÆ.

VOLUME LXXXIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF JUNE TO
THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF JUNE.

1900.

SEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

89127

Chronology of "The Parliamentary Debates."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41	Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42	Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44	Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45	—	1805
— 6 & 7	46	—	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47	Geo. III	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48	Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49	—	1809
— 15 — 17	50	—	1810
— 18 — 20	51	—	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52	—	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53	Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54	—	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55	—	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56	—	1816
— 35 & 36	57	—	1817
— 37 — 38	58	—	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59	Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60	—	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2	—	1821
— 6 — 7	3	—	1822
— 8 — 9	4	—	1823
— 10 — 11	5	—	1824
— 12 — 13	6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7	—	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7	Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8	—	1827
— 18 & 19	9	—	1828
— 20 — 21	10	—	1829
— 22 to 25	11	—	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1831
— 9 — 14	3	—	1832

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7	—	1836
— 36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to

(THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	VICTORIA	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	59	4	VICTORIA	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(FIFTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	95	10	VICTORIA	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 — 107	12	—	1849
—	108 — 113	13	—	1850
—	114 — 118	14	—	1851
—	119 — 122	15	—	(a) 1852

(SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	123	15	VICTORIA	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 — 135	17	—	1854
—	136 — 139	18	—	1855
—	140 — 143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	VICTORIA	(b) 1857
—	148 — 151	21	—	1858
—	152 — 153	22	—	(a) 1859

(EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	VICTORIA	(b) 1859
—	156 — 160	23	—	1860
—	161 — 164	24	—	1861
—	165 — 168	25	—	1862
—	169 — 172	26	—	1863
—	173 — 176	27	—	1864
—	177 — 180	28	—	1865

(NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	VICTORIA	1866
—	185 — 189	30	—	1867
—	190 — 193	31	—	1867-8

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	VICTORIA	1868-9
—	199 — 203	33	—	1870

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	204 to 208	34	VICTORIA	1871
—	209 — 213	35	—	1872
—	214 — 217	36	—	1873

(TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	VICTORIA	1874
—	222 — 226	38	—	1875
—	227 — 231	39	—	1876
—	232 — 236	40	—	1877
—	237 — 242	41	—	1878
—	243 — 249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	VICTORIA	(b) 1880
—	257 — 265	44	—	1881
—	266 — 273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 — 292	47	—	1884
—	293 — 301	48	—	1884-5

(TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	VICTORIA	(a) 1886

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	VICTORIA	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 — 332	51	—	1888
—	333 — 340	52	—	1889
—	341 — 348	53	—	1890
—	349 — 356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78	63	—	1900
—	79	63	—	1900
—	80	63	—	1900
—	81	63	—	1900
—	82	63	—	1900
—	83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900

HER MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, K.G.
Lord President of the Council——His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Lord Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. Viscount Cross, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.
First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Secretaries of State——
 Home Department——Rt. Hon. Sir Matthew White Ridley, Bt.
 Colonial——Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain.
 War——Most Hon. Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G., G.C.M.G., G.C.S.I.
 India——Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Bt.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. George Joachim Goschen.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl Cadogan, K.G.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Charles Thomson Ritchie.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Henry Chaplin.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Lord James of Hereford.
First Commissioner of Works——Rt. Hon. A. Akers Douglas.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Postmaster-General——Marquess of Londonderry, K.G.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir W. Walrond, M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Rt Hon. R. W. Hanbury, M.P.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Vice-President of the Committee of Council——Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon Gorst, M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——W. G. Ellison Macartney, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——	H. T. Anstruther, Esq., M.P. William Hayes Fisher, Esq., M.P. Lord Stanley, M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——	Admiral Sir F. W. Richards, G.C B Vice-Admiral Sir F. G. D. Bedford, K C.B. Rear-Admiral A. K. Wilson, V.C., C.B. Capt. A. W. Moore, C.B., C.M.G. J. Austen Chamberlain, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Rt. Hon. Jesse Collings, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Selborne.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——George Wyndham, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——T. W. Russell, Esq , M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——J. Powell-Williams, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, Q.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. E. Carson, Q.C., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Courts.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hopetoun, G.C.M.G.
Vice-Chamberlain——Hon. Ailwyn E. Fellowes, M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Viscount Curzon, M.P.
Master of the Buckhounds——Rt. Hon. Earl of Coventry.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- General Rt. Hon. Viscount Bridport, G.C.B. (permanent)
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Harris, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.

SCOTLAND.

Chief Secretary——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. J. B. Balfour.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray, Q.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Solicitor-General——Charles Scott-Dickson, Esq., Q.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl Cadogan, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir David Harrel, K.C.B.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, M.P.
Solicitor-General——Geo. Wright, Esq.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.
Clerk of Parliaments——Henry J. L. Graham, Esq., C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——H. C. Malkin, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
- Clerk of Private Bills, and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs——R. W. Monro, Esq.
- Peers' Printed Paper Office——A. Harrison, Esq.
- Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——E. F. Taylor, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
- Principal Clerk of Private Committees—J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.

Other Clerks——F. Skene, Esq.; W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; C. L. Anstruther, Esq. (Clerk attending the Table); Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq.; H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.
Accountant——G. Fulkes, Esq.
Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court; Assistant Copyist——Mr. H. P. Norris.
Messengers——Messrs. W. Worfell, A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. N. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett.
Librarian——S. Arthur Strong, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Messenger——Mr. W. H. G. Strevens.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir Michael A. S. Biddulph, G.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Major-General Sir Arthur Ellis, K.C.V.O., C.S.I.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—(*Cont.*)

Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.

Resident Superintendent——Mr. J. K. Williams.

Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.

Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.

First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.

Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.

Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.

Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.

Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. William Aggas.

Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. T. Kendrick.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Archibald Milman, Esq., C.B.

Clerk-Assistant——Francis B. G. Jenkinson, Esq., C.B.

Second Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.

Principal Clerks——

- Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
- Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
- Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.

Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.; H. C. Tower, Esq.; C. V. Frere, Esq.; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.

Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.; T. L. Webster, Esq.

Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; A. F. B. Williams, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; R. A. Austen Leigh, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq.; C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq.

Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.

Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.

Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Feilden Mitchell.

Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.

Messengers——Messrs. J. J. Shelvey, C. Davie, W. Quantrill, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq.

Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.

Assistant Serjeant——Lieut.-Col. Hon. E. H. Legge.

Doorkeepers——Mr. W. Wilson, Mr. M. Inglefield.

Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.

Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. H. Hambling, Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Tye, Mr. R Hobby, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day.

Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. Henderson, G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington.

Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley; Assistant——Mr. W Broadbent; Porters——Messrs. J. Oram, T. Martin.

Postmaster——Mr. Edmund W. Pike; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.

Office Keeper——Mr. W. Harvey.

Chaplain to the House——Rev. Canon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.

Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq.

Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. E. Chandos Leigh, Q.C., C.B.

Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.

Messenger——Mr. G. T. Viney.

Referee of Private Bills——Alfred Bonham Carter, Esq., C.B.

Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq., J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.

Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq.; Clerk——J. W. G. Bond, Esq.

Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq.; Assistant Librarian——E. G. Harvey, Esq.; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.

Vote Office——

- Chief Clerk——H. A. M. Killick, Esq.
- Assistant Clerks——P. E. Smith, Esq., H. Otway Mayne, Esq.
- Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.

Printers——

- Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
- Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.

Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Horsley.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME LXXXIV.

SEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1900.

COMMONS: THURSDAY, 14TH JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS. *Page*

Glastonbury Corporation Gas Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1

Dorking Water Bill [Lords]; Fishguard Water and Gas Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [Lords]—Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1

Metropolitan District Railway Bill—Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed 1

Mountain Ash Water Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1

Farnworth Urban District Council Bill; Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas, and South Metropolitan Gas Companies Bill; Great Berkhampstead Water Bill [Lords]; Huddersfield Corporation Tramways (Re-committed) Bill; Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill; Menstone Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords]; Mid-Kent Water Bill—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 2

Newport Corporation Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time... 2

Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill; Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas Bill [Lords]; Paignton Urban District Water Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 2

Portland Urban District Gas Bill; South Metropolitan Gas Bill, Wandsworth and Putney Gas Bill—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 3

June 14.] *Page*

Birmingham Corporation (Stock) Bill [Lords]; Scottish American Investment Company, Limited, Bill [Lords]; Sheffield District Railway Bill [Lords]; Wirral Railway Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed 3

Leith Burgh Provisional Order Bill [Lords]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill—As amended, considered; to be read the third time to-morrow 3

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill; London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill—Read a second time, and committed 3

London and St. Katherine Docks and East and West India Dock Companies Bill—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 3

PETITIONS.

Agricultural Holdings Bill and Dogs Regulation Bill—Petition from Morayshire, in favour; to lie upon the Table 3

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (CATTLE, MEAT, AND PRODUCE MARKETS)—Petition from David Tallerman, for establishment in London; to lie upon the Table 3

Dogs Regulation Bill—Petition from Banff, in favour; to lie upon the Table 3

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 4

Education of the Blind (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table 4

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petitions against, from Forres; Edinburgh; Cromarty; Inverkeithen; Grangemouth; and Bridge of Allan; to lie upon the Table 4

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS)—Petition from Tranmere, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 4

Factories and Workshops Bill—Petitions against, from Master Bakers of Chelsea; Central Finsbury; North St. Pancras; Whitechapel; Greenwich; North Kensington; and Clapham; to lie upon the Table 4

Local Authorities Officers' Superannuation Bill—Petition from St. Mary Abbotts, Kensington, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 4

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment (No. 3) Bill—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 4

London Borough Councils (Women's Disabilities Removal) Bill—Petition from Uxbridge, in favour; to lie upon the Table 4

Lunacy Bill—Petition from Horncastle, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 4

June 14.] *Page*

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND—Petitions against establishment, from Kirkcaldy; Dysart; Dundee; Strathpeffer; Dunfermline; and Dingwall; to lie upon the Table 4

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Lumb (two); Rochdale; and Leeds; to lie upon the Table 4

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petition from Chesterfield, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Rochdale; St. Leonard's-on-Sea; Plymouth; Rhosygell; Aberporth; Llanrhystyd; Llandisilio; Crewkerne: Orrell; Rhiwfelen; Llanafan; Chard; Llangwyryfon; Marylebone; South Petherton; Kingsbury; Workington; Hackney; Leyton; Sidcot; Penbryn; Swansea; Pocklington; Maidenhead; Malton; Garndiffaith (three); Talywain; Colgate; Abersychan (three); Edmonton; Blaenclydach; Ferndale (eight); Ystradyfodwg (two); Pentre; Trerhondda Ferndale; Llanfihangel y Croyddin; Gwnnws Upper; Colchester; Cambridge; Lancaster (three); Victoria; Grimesthorpe; Sheffield; Evenwood; Rochdale; St. Helens; London; Willesden; Exeter; Horncastle; Dewsbury; Penrhiw; Blaenpennal; Llanbadarn; Ffosyffin; Nantycunlle; Blaencefn; Blaenplwyf; Blaencaron; Ceulaumaesmawr; Rhiwbwys; Blaenannerch; Llanbadarn Fawr; Llanbadarn Trefeglwys; Llanfihangel; Croyddin; Lledrod; Aberystwyth; Penllyn; New Quay; Llangeitho; Lampeter; Abermenrig; Llanbadarn Fawr (two); Clifton; London (two); Paisley (two); Garndiffaith; Bradford; Haverfordwest; Pembury; Kenchester; Hackney; Peckham; Nunhead; Elland; South Petherton; Colgate; Gravesend (two); Penrhiw; Wetheral; Aberystwyth; Coleshill; Downley; Windsor; Penboyn; Bettws Evan; Rotherham (two); Sheffield (four); Attercliffe; Leytonstone (three); Keswick; Llanbadarn Trefeglwys; Gwnnws; Wigton (two); Exeter; Nantcwnlle; Blennerhasset; Llangranog; Cookham; Chesterfield; Wellington; Banbury; Birmingham (two); Herne Bay; Todmorden; North Shields; and Colchester; to lie upon the Table 5

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Portgordon; Leith; Bonnethill; Dundee (five); Sutherland; Kirkcolm; Nairn; Hamilton; Cambusnethan; and Larkhall; to lie upon the Table 5

School Board Elections (London) Bill—Petition from St. Mary Abbotts, Kensington, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 5

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Wigton; Sheffield (two); Mynach; Rhydfendigaid; Rotherham (two); Wellington; Swansea; Winscombe; North Shields; Grimesthorpe; Leeds; Colchester; Oxford, Lincoln; Bettws Evan; Bronant; Penmorfa; Pontsaeson; Brighouse; Penrhiw (two); Nantcwnlle; Kenchester; Haverfordwest; Abermenrig; Rhiwfelen; Aberporth; Blaenpennal; Llanbadarn Fawr (two): Pensarn; Ffosyffin; Pennwch; Blaencefn; Blaenplwyf; Blaencaron; Ceulaumaesmawr; Rhiwbwys; Blaenanmerch; Llanbadarn Trefeglwys; Trisant; Rhydlwyd; Penllwyn; New Quay; Llangeitho; Lampeter; Llanafan; Ferndale (nine); Pentre; Penygraig; Ystradyfodwg; Ponterwyd; Orrell; Malton; Penbryn (two); Llangwyryfon; Haverfordwest; Llanbadarn-Odwyn; Bwlchyllan; Penrhiw; Aberystwyth (three); Caradog; and Bettws Evan; to lie upon the Table 6

June 14.] *Page*

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Llanfihangel-y-Croyddin Upper (two); Gwnnws Upper; Gwnnws; Llanfihangel Croyddin (two); Llanafard; Ystradyfodwg (three); Llanbadarn Fawr (three); Penbryn; Llangwyryfon; Blaenpennal; Llangrawog; Llanrhystyd (two); Aberporth (two); Llanrhystyd Haminiog; Llandisilio Gogo; Nantycunlle; Verwig; Llanychaiarn; Caron Lower; Ceulaumaesmawr; Aberystwyth; Llanbadarn; Trefeglwys; Lledrod; New Quay; Melindwr; Gwynfil; Lampeter; and Garthely; to lie upon the Table ... 6

Temperance Reform Threefold Option (Scotland) Bill—Petition from St. Andrews, in favour; to lie upon the Table 6

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill—Two Petitions from Glasgow, against proposed alteration of Clause 109; to lie upon the Table 6

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (WHITSUNTIDE RECESS).

THE following Papers presented by Command of Her Majesty during the Whitsuntide Recess were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896:—

1. Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Nos. 2436 to 2449.
2. Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copy of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, No. 526.
3. Malta (Contagious Diseases Law).—Copy of Ordinance No. X. of 1898 (The Contagious Diseases Law) (Malta).
4. Metropolitan Water Supply (Royal Commission).—Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the Water Supply within the limits of the Metropolitan Water Companies. Vol. II.
5. Army (Volunteer) Corps.—Copy of Annual Return of the Volunteer Corps of Great Britain, for the year 1899.
6. Local Taxation (Royal Commission).—Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, with Index and Appendix. Vol. IV.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table 6

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL FUND BOARD (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Sixty-second Annual Report, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 7

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS)—Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the month of February, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table... 7

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES)—Copy presented, of Rules made by the Irish Land Commission under the Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Act, 1899, Section 2, dated the 21st May, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table... 7

PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Returns from the City Marshal of Dublin for the year ended 31st December, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 7

June 14.] *Page*

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which Examinations shall be held for 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 8

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)—Copy presented, of eighteenth Annual Report, being for 1899, Part II. (Report on Salmon Fisheries) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 8

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) (DIETARIES)—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary of Scotland, under the Prisons (Scotland) Act, 1877, establishing new rates of Dietaries for the several classes of prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 8

PATENT OFFICE—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to consider various suggestions which have been made for developing the benefits afforded by the Patent Office to Inventors [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 8

HARWICH HARBOUR—Copy presented, of Abstract of the Accounts of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board from the time of their incorporation down to and inclusive of the 31st March, 1900, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 202] 8

RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Muirkirk, Mauchline, and Dalmellington Railways (Abandonment) Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158A]; referred to the Committee on the Bill 8

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1888—Copies presented, of Orders made by the various County and County Borough Councils in England and Wales under Sections 57 and 59 of the Act, as confirmed by the Local Government Board [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 8

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE)—Copy presented, of Licence granted to Elizabeth Martin, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Royal Victoria Home, Horfield, Bristol [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 9

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER)—Copy presented, of Orders made by the County Council of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dividing the Parliamentary Divisions of Heywood, Leigh, and Stretford into convenient Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 9

EAST INDIA (FAMINE)—Copy presented, of Papers regarding the Famine and the Relief Operations in India during 1899-1900; Vol. I. British Districts, Vol. II. Native States [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 9

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE)—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 28th May; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 203.] 9

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACTS)—Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, under the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869 to 1889, for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 9

June 14.] *Page*

BOARD OF EDUCATION (GENERAL REPORTS)—Copy presented, of General Report for the year 1899 by the Chief Inspector of the South-Eastern Division [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of General Report for the year 1899 by the Chief Inspector of the East Central Division [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 9

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889—Copies presented, of Minutes sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act for the following Counties:—County of Glamorgan (Ninth Minute), dated 21st April, 1900; County of Warwick (Sixth Minute), dated 21st May, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 9

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS—Copy presented, of Scheme for the Management of the Charity of William Price, in the parish of Fareham, in the county of Southampton, founded by Will, dated 24th August, 1721 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 204] 10

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (INCLOSURE, ETC., EXPENSES ACT, 1868)—Copy presented, of Fees to be taken in respect of Transactions under the Tithe and other Acts in accordance with the Provisions of the Inclosure, etc., Expenses Act, 1868 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 10

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1897 (ARMY AND NAVY SERVICE) (MEN EMPLOYED)—Address for "Return showing (1) the number of men employed in Army Services who have received Compensation since July, 1898; (2) the amount of Compensation received in all cases of incapacity through accident; (3) the amount of Compensation received in cases of fatal accident; (4) the amount of weekly wages received by all persons receiving Compensation since the above date."—(*Mr. Woods*) 10

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—CAPE COLONY REBELS—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 10

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT FATALITIES—ARMY CLOTHING—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 11

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—"BOXER" DISTURBANCES, ETC.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley), and Mr. Maclean (Cardiff); Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) and The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 11

ASHANTI—NATIVE RISING—INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour and Mr. J. Chamberlain 14

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY ACT, 1894—Question, Mr. Woods (Essex, Walthamstow); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 14

MIDLAND RAILWAY—FATALITY IN BRECON GOODS YARD—Question, Mr. Maddison (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 15

June 14.] *Page*

CATTERLINE EPISCOPAL SCHOOL—DISMISSAL OF HEAD MISTRESS—Question Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher (Fulham) ... 15

STRANGFORD LOUGH LIGHTHOUSE—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 16

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION PROGRAMME—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 17

THE COMPANIES BILL—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 17

ORDER OF SUPPLY—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 18

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest), Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), and Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour and Mr. Wyndham 18

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

POST OFFICE SITES [EXPENSES]—Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all sums payable by the Postmaster General under any Act of the present session to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire lands for the public service, and of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect the provisions of such Act (Queen's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Ritchie.*) 20

Public Libraries Bill [LORDS]—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 245.]... 20

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill—As amended, to be printed. [Bill 246.] 20

SUPPLY [12TH ALLOTTED DAY]—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS IV.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,585,099, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Education, and of the various Establishments connected therewith, including sundry Grants-in-aid."

DISCUSSION :—

The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) ... 20

Mr. William Jones (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) 36

Mr. Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 40

June 14.] *Page*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Vice-President of the Council."—(*Mr. Samuel Smith.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Sir J. Gorst 58
Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 61
Mr. Birrell (*Fifeshire, W.*) 64
Mr. Hudson (*Hertfordshire, Hitchin*) 67
Sir John Brunner (*Cheshire, Northwich*) 68
Mr. Talbot (*Oxford University*) 69
Mr. Stuart (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*)... 70
Mr. David MacIver (*Liverpool, Kirkdale*) 76
Sir Brampton Gurdon (*Norfolk, N.*) 81
Mr. Flower (*Bradford, W.*) ... 82
Mr. Mather (*Lancashire, Rossendale*) 83
Sir R. C. Jebb (*Cambridge University*) 87
Sir F. S. Powell (*Wigan*) ... 89
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) ... 91
Colonel Milward (*Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon*)... ... 95
Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 96
Mr. Ernest Gray (*West Ham, N.*) 103
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon, etc.*) 113
Sir J. Gorst 119
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) ... 124

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 46 ; Noes, 129. (Division List No. 143.)

It being Midnight, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the Chairman left the chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again to-morrow.

Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill—Read a second time and committed for to-morrow 127

NEW BILL.

ELECTIONS (HOURS OF POLLING ON SATURDAYS)—Bill to amend the Law respecting the Hours of Polling at Elections, and to extend the Hours of Polling on Saturdays, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Flower, Mr. Marks, Mr. Charrington, and Mr. Harry Samuel.

Elections (Hours of Polling on Saturdays) Bill—"To amend the Law respecting the Hours of Polling at Elections, and to extend the Hours of Polling on Saturdays," presented accordingly, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday, 2nd July, and to be printed. [Bill 247] 128

House adjourned at ten minutes past Twelve of the clock.

COMMONS: FRIDAY, 15TH JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered.

Mr. Patrick O'Brien (*Kilkenny*) 129

Bill to be read the third time.

June 15.] *Page*

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment). Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 129

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time upon Monday next 129

Lambeth Water Bill—Read the third time, and passed 130

Southport and Lytham Tramroad Bill—Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed 130

British Gas Light Company (Staffordshire Potteries) Bill—As amended, considered; a Clause added; Bill to be read the third time 130

Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways (changed from "Christchurch, Bournemouth, and Winton Tramways") Bill—As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time ... 130

Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill—As amended, considered; two Clauses added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 130

St. David's Railway (Abandonment) Bill—Not amended, considered; to be read the third time... 130

Alexandra Park Bill; Aston Manor Tramways Bill [Lords]—Read a second time and committed 130

Margate Pier and Harbour Bill [Lords]; South Eastern Railway Bill [Lords]; Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed 131

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill [Annuities]—Committee to consider of authorising the payment out of the Revenues of India of any Annuities created under any Act of the present Session to provide for the vesting of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company in the Secretary of State in Council of India, and of any costs, charges, and expenses incurred under such Act (Queen's Recommendation signified), upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 131

Leith Burgh Provisional Order Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 131

June 15.] *Page*

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill—Read the third time, and passed 131

LONDON (ST. LUKE) PROVISIONAL ORDER—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for improving certain areas situated in the parish of St. Luke, in the county of London, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley. Ordered, That Standing Order 193A be suspended, and that the Bill be read the first time.—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*) ..

London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill—"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for improving certain areas situated in the parish of St. Luke, in the county of London," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 248] 131

LONDON (SOUTHWARK) PROVISIONAL ORDER—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for improving certain areas aituated in the parish of St. George-the-Martyr, Southwark, in the county of London, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley. Ordered, That Standing Order 193A be suspended, and that the Bill be read the first time.—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill—"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for improving certain areas situated in the parish of St. George-the-Martyr, Southwark, in the county of London," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 249] 132

PETITIONS.

Companies Acts Amendment Bill—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 132

Companies Bill—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table 132

County Councillors (Qualification of Women) (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table 132

County Courts Bill—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 132

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment Bill—Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table 132

Distress Abolition and Substitution Bill—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table 132

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 132

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (NEW CODE)—Petition from Bradford, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 133

June 15.] *Page*

Factories and Workshops Bill—Petition from Islington, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Bolton, for alteration, to lie upon the Table 133

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Abolition Bill—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 133

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 133

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act (1854) Amendment Bill—Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table 133

Land Values Taxation (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table 133

Licensing Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table 133

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS)—Petitions for alteration of law, from Pilton; Wakefield (two); and Bodmin; to lie upon the Table ... 133

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 133

Local Government (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 133

Lunacy Bill—Petitions from Guildford, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 133

Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 133

Midwives Bill—Petitions in favour, from Derby; and Liverpool (three); to lie upon the Table 134

Petty Customs Abolition (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 134

Public Houses (Scotland) Later Opening Bill—Petition from Dumbarton, in favour; to lie upon the Table 134

Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 134

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND—Petitions against establishment, from Grantown; and Kingussie; to lie upon the Table 134

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Gloucester; Glastonbury; Luton; Martock; and East Dulwich; to lie upon the Table 134

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions against, from Northwich; Starcross; Bolton; Exeter; Ossett; Burslem; Dewsbury; Lincoln; Plymouth; and Devonport; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Birkenhead; Bamber; Bamber Bridge; Kennington; Glastonbury; Pilton; West Kirby; Hoylake; Liscard; Birmingham; Wakefield (two); Pumpsaint; Twynllanan; Cilycwm;

June 15.] *Page*

Llansadwru; Celnberrach; Talsarn; Guildford; South Hackney; Castle Cary; Hackney; Leamington Spa; Dumbarton; Alresford; Stratford; Plymouth; East Ham; Bradford (seven); Addington and Ringstead; Durdham Down; Wisbech; Shrewsbury; Richmond; Sittingbourne; Abercanaid; Merthyr Tydfil (five); Cefncoedycymer (three); Plymouth; Rowbarton; Taunton (five); Thirsk and Sowerby; Hampstead (three); Birmingham (nineteen); Spitalfields; Bethnal Green; Lancaster; Northfield; Bourneville; Maidstone; Severn Street; Longbridge (two); Badsey; Brighouse; Wisbech; Barnsley; Luton; Eccles; Chesham; Preston Patrick; Clevedon (two); Neath; Liverpool; Hereford; Edinburgh (two); Croydon; Manchester; Brixton; Dore and Totley; Kingsbrompton; Highworth; Dresden; Dowlais (two); Vaynor; Cwmaman; Abernant; Cwmbach; Aberaman (two); Lincoln (two); Troedyrhiw (two); Goole (two); Bennington; Lynsted; Diss; Doncaster; Lees; Acton Bridge; Holcombe Rogus; Topsham; Hirwain; Hay Hill; Bath; Coleford; Lower Weston (two); Tor; Ryhill; Torquay; West Melton; Middlesbrough; Cockington; Walton Park; Sheffield (eleven); Milverton; Martock; Pandine; Llangewad; Bankyfelin; Kyffig; Mydrim; New Wandsworth; Oswestry; Farnworth; Bristol (four); Hopton; Bloomsbury; Chorley; Yardley; Ashford; Batheaston; North Walsham; Liverpool; Wrentham; New Wittingham; Willesborough; Clifton; Dorchester; Pontyclun (three); Bwylchygwynt; Barry; Weston; Gorwydd; Nottingham; Beckenham; Canterbury; Barry Dock; Walcot; Culmstock; Horwich; Mile End; Aberdare (thirty-three); Islington; Govan; Esholt; Manchester; Llanddimiol; Liscard; Swindon; Arnold; Barnstaple; Sheffield (two); Brighouse (six); London (three); Coningsby; Reigate; Northwich; Liverpool; Edinburgh; Shirland; Buckhurst Hill; Stonebroom; Allendale; Stocksfield; Bushey (two); Ywysybwl; East Dulwich; Anerley; Pontefract; Torquay; Nottingham; Southampton; Ealing; Saltash; Bushey Heath; Ebbw Vale; Rotherham; Oswestry; New Bushey; Derby (two); Strood; Llanfabon; and Bunhill Fields; to lie upon the Table 134

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Motherwell; Aberdeen; Dundee (two); Perth (two); Glasgow (three); Liberton; Leith; Paisley; Deerness; Johnstone; Kilbarchan; Alva; Cobden Street; Dunscore; Arbroath; Strathaven; Edinburgh (four); Kincardine O'Neil; Dollar; and Lanark; to lie upon the Table 135

South African War (Form of Intercessory Prayer)—Petition from the Protestant Church of England Union of New South Wales, for withdrawal; to lie upon the Table 135

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Taunton; Wakefield (two); Caio; Twynllanan; Cilycwm; Llansadwrn; Llanfihangel Aberbythych; Glastonbury; Dumbarton; Stratford; Barking; Guildford; Plymouth; Highworth; Manchester; Lees; Castleford; Islington; Sheffield; Pandine; Neath; Pontynyswen; Llanfihangel Abercowin; Kyffig; Exeter; Mydrim; Birmingham; North Walsham; Dundee; Eccles; Strood; Lewes; St. Ives; Hull; Gloucester; Longbridge (two); Luton; Chesham; Liverpool; Southport; Wellington; Clevedon; Hereford; Edinburgh; Croydon; Northumberland; Elim; Swindon; Macclesfield; Bargoed; Ynysybwl; Caerphilly; Ystradmynach; Stonebroom; Tregaron; Bridgend; Ebbw Vale; Llantrissant; Bath (two); Pembroke Dock; Risca; Bodmin; and Oswestry; to lie upon the Table 136

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Caio; Twynllanan; Cilycwm; Llansadwrn; Islington; Llanfihangel Aberbythych; Llanddansant; Pandine; Pontynyswen; Bankyfelin; Kyffig; Mydrim; Llanddimiol; Ynysybwl; Ebbw Vale; Llantrissant; and Cadoxton; to lie upon the Table 136

Teinds (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Haddington; in favour; to lie upon Table 136

Town Councils Scotland Bill—Petition from Perth, against proposed alteration of Clause 109; to lie upon the Table 136

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Experiments on Living Animals—Motion made, for an Address for "Return showing the number of Experiments performed on Living Animals during the year 1899 under Licences granted under the Act 39 and 40 Vic., c. 77, distinguishing Painless from Painful Experiments (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 215, of Session 1899."—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) ... 136

The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Jesse Collings, Birmingham, Bordesley) 137

Motion agreed to.

Prisons (Scotland) (Dietaries)—Paper [presented 14th June] to be printed. [No. 205] 137

London County Council—Copy presented, of Returns relating to the Council up to 31st March, 1900, with Estimate of Expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 206] 137

Superannuation Act, 1884—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 25th May, 1900, declaring that Mr. John Roberts, Turnkey, Consular Gaol, Yokohama, Consular Service was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 137

Superannuation Act, 1884—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 4th June, 1900, declaring that Mr. James Alfred Dawson, Rural Postman, Post Office Department, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 138

Superannuations—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 6th June, 1900, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the Office of Sanitary Surveyor under the Board of Trade (Mercantile Marine Services), professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 138

East India (Progress and Condition)—Copy presented, of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1898-9. Thirty-fifth Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 138

Voluntary Schools Act, 1897 (Associations)—Copy presented, of List of (1) Associations constituted under The Voluntary Schools Act, 1897; (2) Associated Schools and Amounts of Aid Grant paid; and (3) Unassociated Schools and Amounts of Aid Grant paid, 1899-1900; to lie upon the Table 139

June 15.] *Page*

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, 1899-1900—Return ordered, "of the amount received in respect of each Administrative County and County Borough in England and Wales for Local Taxation Licence Duties and penalties, under the Local Government Act, 1888, in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*) 139

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*) 139

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*) ... 139

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANK—Return ordered, "(1) from each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives; the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended the 20th day of November, 1899; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the treasurer at the 20th day of November, 1899; the total amount of the separate surplus fund on the 20th day of November, 1899; other assets, including estimated value of bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Government stock standing to the credit of depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such a Return a list of all such savings banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vic. c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Banks; showing, in each case, the number of such banks, as well as the number and amount of depositors' accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the officers of such banks respectively, and showing also the years in which such banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their depositors' balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the form of the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively, for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom; and (2) for the year ending the 20th day of November, 1899, showing the total number of depositors in trustee savings banks; the total number of deposits; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 297, of Session 1899)."—(*Sir John William Maclure*)... 139

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—SIEGE OF LADYSMITH—DISAPPEARANCE OF STORES Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 140

June 15.] *Page*

LADYSMITH—SIR G. WHITE'S DESPATCHES—Question, Mr. Lafone (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 141

ALLEGED CLAIM ON THE MAYOR OF LADYSMITH—Question, Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 141

ALLEGED OUTRAGES ON BOER FEMALES BY BRITISH TROOPS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 141

JAMESON RAID INDEMNITY—Question, Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 142

RESIGNATION OF THE CAPE MINISTRY—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 142

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT FATALITIES—ARMY CLOTHING—Questions, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), Sir Edward Gourley (Sunderland), Major Rasch (Essex, S.E.), Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.), Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.), Sir John Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich), Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central), Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), and Sir J. Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton); Answers, Mr. Wyndham... 143

VOLUNTEERS—PAYMENT OF CAMP ALLOWANCES—LEAVE TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—Question, Mr. Boscawen (Kent, Tunbridge); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 148

VOLUNTEER EMERGENCY PROPOSALS—Question, Mr. Boscawen; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 148

MOUNTED INFANTRY VOLUNTEERS—CAMP ALLOWANCES—Question, Mr. Boscawen; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 149

H.M.S. "EUROPA"—BELLEVILLE BOILERS—Question, Mr. Allan (Gateshead); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, Hanover Square) 149

MALTA—TUNNY NET TAX—Question, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (Cork); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 150

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH BILL—THE APPEAL CLAUSES—Questions, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, Mid) and Mr. William Redmond; Answers, Mr. J. Chamberlain 151

TONGA—BRITISH PROTECTORATE—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 152

ZANZIBAR—CHURCH MISSIONARY STATION AT RABAIS—Question, Mr. Duckworth (Lancashire, Middleton); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 152

INDIA—BRITISH CAVALRY CARBINES—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing)... 153

INDIAN FAMINE AND PLAGUE STATISTICS—SUGGESTED ROYAL COMMISSION—PARLIAMENTARY GRANT, ETC.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor, Mr. William Redmond, and Sir William Wedderburn (Banffshire); Answers, Lord G. Hamilton and the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 153

June 15.] *Page*

NATIONAL GALLERY—PRECAUTIONS AGAINST FIRE—Questions, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley), Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.), and Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 157

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 159

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES)—MR. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. Munro Ferguson (added in respect of the Agricultural Holdings Bill); and had appointed in substitution: Sir William Wedderburn. Report to lie upon the Table 159

SUPPLY [13TH ALLOTTED DAY]—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS IV.

1. £5,585,099, to complete the sum for Board of Education.

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 160
Mr. Carvell Williams (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) 161
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 164
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 166
The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) ... 168
Mr. Herbert Lewis 173
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 173
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) ... 175
Sir John Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich) 176
Mr. Morrell (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) 177
Mr. Carvell Williams 178
Mr. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby) 178
Sir J. Gorst 178

Vote agreed to.

3. £86,280, to complete the sum for British Museum.

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 179
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 182
The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 183
Lord Balcarres 185
Mr. William Redmond ... 186
Mr. Stanley Leighton (Shropshire, Oswestry) ... 186
Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.) ... 187
Mr. Lecky (Dublin University) ... 188
Mr. Gibson Bowles 188
The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 189
Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade) 189
Mr. Gibson Bowles 189
Sir F. S. Powell (Wigan) ... 190

Vote agreed to.

June 15.] *Page*

3. £8,374, to complete the sum for National Gallery.

4. £2,520, to complete the sum for National Portrait Gallery.

5. £4,967, to complete the sum for Wallace Collection.

6. £35,724 to complete the sum for Scientific Investigation, etc

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Gibson Bowles 191
Lord Balcarres 192
Mr. Hanbury 192
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) ... 193
Mr. A. J. Balfour 193

Vote agreed to.

7. £67,500, to complete the sum for Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales.

DISCUSSION :—

Sir F. S. Powell 194
Mr. Stuart... 196
Sir J. Leng (*Dundee*) ... 200
Mr. Allan (*Gateshead*) ... 202
Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid*) 203
Mr. James A. Campbell (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 205
Mr. Hanbury 206
Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 207
Mr. Stuart (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*)... 209
Mr. Caldwell 210
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 210

Vote agreed to.

8. £5 to complete the sum for London University.

CLASS V.

9. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £255,384, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions abroad, and of the Consular Establishments abroad and other Expenditure chargeable on the Consular Vote."

Earl Percy... 211
Mr. Gibson Bowles 214

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item P (Salaries of the General Consular Service) be reduced by £100, in respect of the salary of the Agent and Consul General at Zanzibar."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. J. A. Pease (*Northumberland, Tyneside*) ... 218
Mr. Bayley (*Derbyshire, Chesterfield*) 222
Mr. Duckworth (*Lancashire, Middleton*) 225
The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford*) 233
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 238
Commander Bethell (*Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness*) 240

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 39 ; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 144).

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Elliot (Durham) ... 243
Mr. Brodrick 243

Question put, and agreed to.

10. £167,186, to complete the sum for Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway.

Sir Charles Dilke 244
Mr. Brodrick 244
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 245

Vote agreed to.

11. £256,955, to complete the sum for Colonial Services.

Sir Charles Dilke 245
Mr. A. J. Balfour 245

Vote agreed to.

12. £1,000, to complete the sum for Cyprus (Grant-in-aid).

Mr. Pierpoint (Warrington) 245
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 246

Vote then agreed to.

13. £14,350, to complete the sum for Subsidies to Telegraph Companies.

Sir Charles Dilke 248
Mr. Hanbury 248

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Mr. Balfour*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at Eleven of the clock till Monday next.

LORDS: MONDAY, 18TH JUNE, 1900.

LORD INCHIQUIN—Petition of Lucius William, Baron Inchiquin in the Peerage of Ireland, claiming a right to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland; read, and referred to the Lord Chancellor to consider and report thereupon to the House 249

NEW PEER—The Right Honourable Sir Richard Everard Webster, G.C.M.G., late Her Majesty's Attorney General, Keeper or Master of the Rolls and Records of the Court of Chancery in England, having been created Baron Alverstone of Alverstone in the Isle of Wight and county of Southampton—was (in the usual manner) introduced 249

June 18.] *Page*

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND—Writs and Returns electing the Viscount Frankfort de Montmorency a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Lord Inchiquin, deceased; with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto. Delivered (on oath), and Certificate read 249

SAT FIRST—The Marquess of Winchester sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother 249

TOOK THE OATH—The Viscount Frankfort de Montmorency took the Oath... 249

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—Bradford Corporation, Great Western Railway, Baker Street and Waterloo Railway. Also the Certificates that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3), Metropolitan Common Scheme (Petersham) Provisional Order. Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with : Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4). And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—Roe's Patent (Petition for Bill). The same were ordered to lie on the Table 249

Workington Railways and Docks Bill [H.L.]—Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee 250

Morecambe Urban District Council (Gas) Bill—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 250

ALEXANDRA PARK (PETITION FOR BILL); Roe's Patent (Petition for Bill)—Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Friday next 250

London and South Western Railway Bill—Report of Her Majesty's Attorney General received, and ordered to lie on the Table 250

North Warwickshire Water Bill—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 1st and 28th of May last discharged, and Bill committed for Monday next 250

Great Eastern Railway Bill—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 30th of April and the 28th of May last discharged, and Bill committed 250

Walsall Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 251

Widnes and Runcorn Bridge Bill—The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported with Amendments 251

Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [H.L.].—The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 251

June 18.] *Page*

Nottingham Corporation Bill—Read 2^a, and committed 251

South Lancashire Tramways Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 251

Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill—Read 3^a, and committed 251

Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 251

Southport Water Bill; Hastings Harbour Bill; Maidenhead Gas Bill—Read 3^a, and passed 251

Hoylake and West Kirby Improvement Bill; Southport Extension and Tramways Bill—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 251

Farnworth Urban District Council Bill; Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas, and South Metropolitan Gas Companies Bill; Halifax Corporation Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Tramways Bill; Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill; Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill; Lambeth Water Bill; London and Saint Katherine Docks and East and West India Dock Companies Bill; Metropolitan District Railway Bill; Mid-Kent Water Bill; Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill; Portland Urban District Gas Bill; South Metropolitan Gas Bill; Southport and Lytham Tramroad Bill; Wandsworth and Putney Gas Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 252

Glastonbury Corporation Gas Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 252

Leigh Burgh Provisional Order Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment 252

Dorking Water Bill [H.L.]; Fishguard Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Mountain Ash Water Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 252

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 252

Withington Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Crofton be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Crawshaw; read, and agreed to 253

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]; Hamilton Burgh Bill; Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill; Airdrie, Coatbridge, and District Water Trust Bill; Airdrie and Coatbridge Tramways Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; Lee Conservancy Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Buckinghamshire be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Lichfield; read, and agreed to 253

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 109) 253

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]—Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 253

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill [H.L.]—Committed to a Committee of the whole House 253

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow 253

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^{a} (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 254

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by Her Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Order of the House of the 17th February, 1896, viz.:—

TRADE REPORTS—I. Annual Series—No. 2436. United States (Trade of the Philippine Islands, 1899). (May 31.) No. 2437, China (Pakoi); No. 2438. Italy (Genoa and District); No. 2439. Netherlands (Amsterdam); No. 2440. France (Pondicherry); No. 2441. Turkey (Beirut and Coast of Syria); No. 2442. Persia (Persian Gulf); No. 2443. China (Swatow) (June 6.) No. 2444. Japan (Yokohama); No. 2445. Spain (Bilbao and District); No. 2446. France (Dunkirk); No. 2447. Russia (Taganrog); No. 2448. Switzerland; No. 2449. China (Hangchow). (June 11.)

II. Miscellaneous Series.—No. 526. Shipping and shipbuilding on the American lakes. (May 31.)

MALTA—Ordinance No. X. of 1898 (the Contagious Diseases Law). (May 31.)

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY (ROYAL COMMISSION)—Minutes of evidence taken before Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the water supply within the limits of the Metropolitan Water Companies. Vol. 2. (June 6.)

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS)—Annual Return for 1899. (June 7.)

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND)—Eighteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1899—
Part II. Report on Salmon Fisheries (June 8);
Part III. Scientific Investigations. (June 12.)

LOCAL TAXATION (ROYAL COMMISSION)—Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Vol. IV. (June 8.)

June 18.] *Page*

BOARD OF EDUCATION—

1. South-Eastern Division. General Report for the year 1899, by I. W. Danby, Esq., Chief Inspector.

2. East Central Division. General Report for the year 1899, by Rev. C. Du Port, Chief Inspector. (June 8.)

3. Report to the Board of Education of the Proceedings of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales under the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869 to 1889, for the year 1899. (June 12.)

4. Minutes sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1899, for the counties of—

I. Warwick (sixth minute);
II. Glamorgan (ninth minute). (June 12.)

5. Associations constituted under the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897.
6. Associated schools and amounts of aid grant paid;
7. Unassociated schools and amounts of aid grant paid. (June 16.)

INDIAN FAMINE—Papers regarding the famine and the relief operations in India during 1890-1900. Vol. I. British Districts. Vol. II. Native States. (June 15.)

PATENT OFFICE—Report of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to consider various suggestions which have been made for developing the benefits afforded by the Patent Office to inventors. (June 15.)

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—1. (Proceedings.) Return for the month of February, 1900. 2. (Rules.) Rules, dated 21st May, under the Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Act, 1899, section 2. (June 15.)

LOAN FUND BOARD (IRELAND)—Sixty-second Annual Report, for 1899. (June 15.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 254

ARMY:—I. (Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances).—List of exceptions to the Army Regulations sanctioned during the year ended 31st March, 1900. II. (Volunteer Rifle Ranges).—Grants which it is proposed to make out of the sum of £40,000 taken for this purpose in the Military Works Loan, 1899 256

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES)—No. 2450. Germany (Grand Duchy of Baden). No. 2451. Spain (Canary Islands). No. 2452. Netherlands (Java). No. 2453. Tripoli. No. 2454. Brazil (Porto Alegre). No. 2455. Denmark. No. 2456. Turkey (Bengazi). No. 2457. China (Wuhu). No. 2458. Italy (Elba). No. 2459. Turkey (Baghdad). No. 2460. Spain (Trade of Barcelona for the year 1899) 256

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING—Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1899 256

DUBLIN HOSPITALS—Forty-second Report of the Board of Superintendence, with appendices for the years 1899-1900 256

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894—Orders in Council of the 15th May, 1900—1. Approving certain pilotage byelaws made by the Humber Pilotage Commissioners. 2. Recognising in this country certificates of free board (load line) issued by the Government of South Australia to vessels registered in that colony 256

June 18.] *Page*

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875—Order in Council of the 15th May, 1900, declaring that acetyline in admixture with air or oxygen gas shall be deemed to be an explosive within the meaning of the Explosives Act, 1875 257

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) (DIETARIES)—Rules made by the Secretary for Scotland under the Prisons (Scotland) Act, 1877, establishing new rates of dietaries for the several classes of prisoners 257

INDIA (PROGRESS ARD CONDITION)—Statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1898-99. Thirty-fifth Number 257

SUPERANNUATION—TREASURY MINUTES—

I. Declaring that the following persons were appointed without Civil Service certificates through inadvertence on the part of the Heads of their Departments, viz. :—John Roberts, turnkey, Consular Gaol, Yokohama Consular Service; James Alfred Dawson, rural postman, Post Office Department.

II. Declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Sanitary Surveyor under the Board of Trade (Mercantile Marine Services) professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service are required 257

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL—Returns relating to the Council up to the 31st March, 1900; with estimate of expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1901 257

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853 TO 1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE)—Licence granted by Her Majesty to Elizabeth Martin, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting the said Elizabeth Martin to be at large on condition that she enter the Royal Victoria Home, Horfield, near Bristol 257

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER)—Orders made by the County Council of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dividing the Parliamentary divisions of Heywood, Leigh, and Stretford into convenient polling districts 258

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND)—Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which examinations for 1900 shall be held... 258

PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND)—Return from the City Marshal of Dublin for the year ended 31st December, 1899 258

INCLOSURES, ETC., EXPENSES ACT, 1868—Fees to be taken in respect of transactions under the Tithe and other Acts, in accordance with the provisions of the Inclosure, etc., Expenses Act, 1868 258

HARWICH HARBOUR—Abstract of Accounts of receipts and expenditure of Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board, to 31st day of March, 1900, with report on proceedings, etc. 258

FINES, ETC. (IRELAND)—Abstract of the Accounts of fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks for the year 1898 258

DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1865—Accounts of receipts and expenditure under the Act for the year 1899 258

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

June 18.] *Page*

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877—Statutes made by the Governing Bodies of—I. St. John's College, Oxford, on 9th December, 1899, amending Statutes III. 1, III. 14, V. 4 (a), and XV. 2, of the Statutes of the College. II. Worcester College, Oxford, on 24th January, 1900, amending Statute III. 16 of the Statutes of the College. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 107) ... 258

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS—Scheme for the management of the charity of William Price, in the parish of Fareham, in the county of Southampton, founded by will dated 24th August, 1721. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 108)... 259

RICHMOND BRIDGE—Account for the year 1899. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 209

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN DISTURBANCES—RECENT OPERATIONS—Question, The Earl of Kimberley; Answer, The Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Salisbury) 259

Marriage Act Amendment Bill [H.L.]—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 263

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly.

Moved, "That the Standing Committee be negatived."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

The Earl of Kimberley ... 264 *The Earl of Halsbury* 264

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill [Lords]—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House adjourned at Five of the clock.

COMMONS: MONDAY, 18TH JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH)—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First

Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Barnsley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Bill [Lords]; Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords]; Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill [Lords]; Margate Corporation Bill [Lords]; Mersey Railway Bill [Lords]; Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill [Lords]; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]; Rotherham Corporation Bill [Lords]; South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Westgate and Birchington Water Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 266

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—Roe's Patent Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 267

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO NOT COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have not been complied with, viz. :—North Eastern Railway Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 267

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.—Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Brighton and Preston United District, etc.) Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of the Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 267

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 268

Farnworth Urban District Council Bill—Read the third time, and passed 268

Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas, and South Metropolitan Gas Companies Bill—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title] ... 268

Great Berkhampstead Water Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 268

Huddersfield Corporation Tramways Bill—Read the third time, and passed 268

June 18.] *Page*

Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title] 268

Lancashire Inebriates Acts Board Bill [Lords]; Menstone Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 269

Mid-Kent Water Bill—Read the third time, and passed 269

Newport Corporation Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 269

Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill—Read the third time, and passed 269

Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 269

Portland Urban District Gas Bill—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title] 269

South Metropolitan Gas Bill; Wandsworth and Putney Gas Bill—Read the third time, and passed 269

Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 269

Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 269

Cowes Pier Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 269

Great Central Railway Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time... 269

Halifax Corporation Bill—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 269

Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill—As amended, considered; Amendments made. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 270

London and Saint Katherine Docks and East and West India Dock Companies Bill—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 270

Motherwell Water Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 270

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill—Read a second time, and committed 270

June 18.] Page

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Read a second time, and committed 270

Great Indian Peninsular Railway Company Bill [**Annuities**]—Considered in Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the creation of Annuities to be charged on and payable out of the Revenues of India in lieu of the sum of money amounting to £34,859,217 17s. 6d. agreed upon for the purchase by the Secretary of State in Council of India of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and the payment of any costs and expenses incurred by the said Secretary of State under any Act of the present Session for vesting the said undertaking in the said Secretary of State in Council of India; and also any costs, charges, and expenses of obtaining and passing the said Act not provided by the surplus profits arising from the said undertaking for the half-year ending the 30th day of June, 1900."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 272

No one rising to reply :—

Whereupon Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles*)—put and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow 27 2

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to Amendment to—Otley Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; Amendments to—Cork, Bandon, and South Coast Railway Bill [Lords], Higham Ferrers Water Bill [Lords], Cleethorpes Gas Bill [Lords], Dundee Harbour Bill [Lords], London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [Lords], without amendment 272

Oldham Corporation Bill—Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section B), with Amendments; [Costs awarded]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 272

PETITIONS.

British Museum Bill—Petition from Worcestershire, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 273

DOULATH KHAN—Petition of Doulath Khan, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 273

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petitions against, from Winning Park; Ardrossan; Haddington; Stirling; Renfrew; Pollokshaws; Bathgate; Crail; Anstruther Easter; Kilrenny; Dalkeith; and Aberbrothock; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Stirling, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Aberdeen, in favour; to lie upon the Table 27

Executors (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 273

June 18.] Page

Factories and Workshops Bill—Petitions against, from Limehouse; and St. George's, Hanover Square; to lie upon the Table 273

Local Authorities Officers' Superannuation Bill—Petition from Sheffield, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.
Petition from Kington, in favour, to lie upon the Table... 273

Lunacy Bill—Petition from Sheffield, for alteration; to lie upon the Table ... 273

Public Houses (Scotland) Later Opening Bill—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 273

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND—Petitions against establishment, from Brechin; Fraserburgh; and Montrose; to lie upon the Table ... 273

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Ellwood; Kingsclere; Woodlands; Bideford; Pill; and Holbeach; to lie upon the Table 273

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions against, from Wakefield; Swansea; and Huddersfield; to lie upon the Table.
Petitions in favour, from Bleasby Moor; North Willingham; Bridgwater; Exeter; Fletchertown; Huddersfield (four); Lambeth; Birmingham (three); Bedford; Brixton Hill; Louth; Upper Norwood; Barnstaple; Woodhouse; Hillsbro'; Spotland (two); Rochdale; Eccup; Shepshed; Winchester; East Brighton; Sheerness; Diss; Glasgow (two); Dewsbury (two); Canterbury; East Cornwall; Pill; Gateshead-on-Tyne; Ipswich; Matlock; Aberffrwd; West Norwood; Bideford; Durham; Redhill; Barnstaple; Wolverhampton; Kilmarnock; Tulse Hill; Appledore; Sittingbourne; Maryport; Clifton; Westbury Park; Bosworth; Stapleton; Woolwich; Howden-le-Wear; Cleveland; Holbeach (three); Taunton (three); Upper Bont; Muswell Hill; Golcar; Delph; Bath (two); East Bristol; Garth Maesteg; Maesteg; Resolven; Brighouse; Queensbury; Stratford (two); Llantrissant; Barry Dock; Bristol (twelve); Luton; St. George (two); Fishponds; Shettleston; Lochgelly; Levern; Henley; Wells; Scarborough; Brynamman; Llandebie (two); Llanedi; Kingsclere; Woodlands; Llannon; Stockton-on-Tees; Manordilo; Ealing; Carmarthen; Newcastle; Barton-upon-Irwell; Barnsley (five); Rotherham; Dartford; Halifax; Ash; Adisham; Yardley; Cleveland; Uxbridge (two); Kingsdown; Pontlottyn; Hebburn Colliery; South Shields; St. Neots; Cricklewood; Kensington; London; York; Bexley; Warmley (seven); Lonwells Green; Warmley Tower (four); Siston Common (three); Kingswood; Wallsend on Tyne; Wincobank; St. Davids; Folkestone; Llansawel; Llanlluan; Gateshead; Wigan (two); Sheffield (six); Reigate; Malvern; Wrexham; and Higham-on-the-Hill; to lie upon the Table ... 273

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 273

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Largs; Keith; Dumfries; Dalbeattie; Campbeltown; Pittenweem; Ardrossan; Glasgow (two); Aylesford; Darvel; Arbroath; St. Andrews; Cramond; and Dundee (six); to lie upon the Table ... 273

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS ON ACTIVE SERVICE—Petitions for legislation, from Sheffield and Dartford; to lie upon the Table 274

June 18.] *Page*

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Llansawel; Garth Maesteg; Bristol; Maesteg; Hay Mills; Kingsclere Woodlands; Scarborough; Brynamman; Llandebie (two); Llanedi; Manordilo; Shettleston; Northfield; London; Bath; Sheffield (three); Ash; Wallsend; St. Neots; Pontlottyn; York; Bridgwater; North Wellingham; Bleasby Moor; Hillsbro'; Eccup; Birmingham; Spotland (two); Winchester; Sheerness; Rochdale; Bedford; Gateshead-on-Tyne; South Devon; Glasgow; Redhill; Bideford (two); Wolverhampton; Llanbadarn Upper; Durham; Woolwich; Pill; Taunton (two); Brixton Hill; Bargoed; Liverpool; Pontypridd; Higham-on-the-Hill; Llanarthney; St. David's; Gateshead; Wrexham; and Wigan (two); to lie upon the Table 274

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Garth Maesteg; Brynamman; Llannon; Llandebie (two); Llanedi; Manordilo; Pembroke Dock; Pen Buallt; Pontlottyn; Maesteg; Pontnewynydd; Aberffrwd; Upper Bont; St. David's; and Llanlluan; to lie upon the Table 274

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION)—Paper [presented 15th June] to be printed. [No. 207] 274

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING—Copy presented, of Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 274

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 208] 274

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 209] 275

RAILWAYS—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade on an Application made during the year 1899 under the Railway Companies' Powers Act, 1864, and of the Proceedings of the Board of Trade with respect thereto [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 210] ... 275

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES)—Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations sanctioned during the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 275

ARMY (VOLUNTEER RIFLE RANGES)—Copy presented, of Grants which it is proposed to make out of the sum of £40,000 taken for this purpose in the Military Works Loan, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 275

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS—Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 15th June; *Mr. Jesse Collings*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 211] 275

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES)—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2450 to 2460 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 275

June 18.] *Page*

DUBLIN HOSPITALS—Copy presented, of Forty-second Report of the Board of Superintendence, with Appendices, for the year 1899-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 275

DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1865—Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure under the Act for the year 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 212] 275

FINES, ETC. (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Abstract Accounts of Fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks for 1898 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 213] 276

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 15th May, 1900, approving certain Pilotage Bye-laws made by the Humber Pilotage Commissioners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 15th May, 1900, recognising in this Country Certificates of Free Board (Load Line) issued by the Government of South Australia to Vessels registered in that Colony [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 276

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1887 (OXFORD)—Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of St. John's College, Oxford, on 9th December, 1899, amending Statutes III. 1, III. 14, V. 4a, and XV. 2, of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 214.]

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Worcester College, Oxford, on 24th January, 1900, amending Statute III. 16 of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 215] 276

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 15th May, 1900, declaring that Acetylene, in admixture with air or oxygen gas, shall be deemed to be an explosive within the meaning of the Explosives Act, 1875 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 276

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT)—Copy presented, of Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 276

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE OBSERVATORY—Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 276

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—Richmond Bridge.—Cash Account for the year 1899 [by Act] 276

EAST INDIA RAILWAYS (PURCHASE)—Address for "Copy of any Correspondence between the India Office and the Bank of England regarding the rate of interest to be adopted in the calculation of the annuities for the purchase of the East Indian Railway, the Eastern Bengal Railway, the Scinde, Punjab, and Delhi Railway, and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, respectively."—(*Mr. Cohen*) 277

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie*) 277

June 18.] *Page*

MERCHANT SHIPPING, 1899—Copy ordered, "of Tables showing the progress of British Merchant Shipping."—(*Mr. Ritchie*) 277

MARRIAGE ACT, 1898—Copy ordered, "giving the following particulars of the results of the Marriage Act, 1898, during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900—1. Number of 'registered buildings' for which 'authorised persons' have been appointed under Section 6 of the Act, classified according to religious denominations as follows: Wesleyan Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, other denominations; 2. Number of 'authorised persons' so appointed; 3. Number of marriages which have taken place under the Act; 4. Number of cases in which there have been serious irregularities by 'authorised persons' in connection with the marriage certificates."—(*Mr. Price*) 277

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—SIEGE OF LADYSMITH — CLAIM AGAINST THE MAYOR—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, the Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 277

CASUALTY LIST—4TH SHERWOOD FORESTERS MILITIA—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 278

FARQUHAR'S FARM ENGAGEMENT—STRENGTH OF THE 60TH RIFLES—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 278

SETTLEMENT OF SOLDIERS IN SOUTH AFRICA AFTER THE WAR — Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Belfast, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 279

OFFICERS' ESTATES AND THE DEATH DUTIES—Question, General Russell (Cheltenham); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.) 279

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—EXTENSION TO NAVAL AND MILITARY SERVANTS—WAR RELIEF FUNDS COMMITTEE—Questions, Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) and Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.)... 281

PENSIONS FOR DISCHARGED WOUNDED AND SICK PRISONERS—Questions, Sir J. Leng (Dundee) and Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 280

TRAINED DOGS FOR OUTPOST DUTY—Question, General Russell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 281

RESERVE OF ARMS—Questions, Mr. Goulding (Wiltshire, Devizes), Mr. Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield), and Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 282

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT FATALITIES—ARMY CLOTHING—Questions, Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.), Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.), Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.), and Colonel Sandys (Lancashire, Bootle); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 282

MILITIA OFFICERS' TRAINING ALLOWANCES—Questions, Mr. Lowe (Birmingham, Edgbaston); Answers, Mr. Wyndham... 285

June 18.] *Page*

CHANNEL FLEET—VISIT TO SHETLAND—Question, Sir Leonard Lyell (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 285

ASHANTI — NATIVE RISING—INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE—Question, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 286

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—RECENT OPERATIONS—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) and Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 287

MOROCCO—SUGGESTED EUROPEAN INTERVENTION—Question, Mr. Hazell (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 288

EAST INDIA RAILWAY CONTRACTS—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 288

BRITISH TRADE WITH THE SOUDAN—Question, Mr. Hedderwick (Wick Burghs); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 289

RAILWAY COMPANIES AND PASSENGERS' PERSONAL LUGGAGE—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) and Sir Cameron Gull (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answers, Mr. Ritchie 289

EDUCATION OF POOR LAW CHILDREN—Question, Mr. Trevelyan; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Chaplin, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 291

BOARDING OUT PAUPER CHILDREN—Question, Mr. Trevelyan; Answer, Mr. Chaplin 291

METROPOLITAN VEHICULAR REGULATIONS—Question, General Russell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool) 292

REPORT OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF FACTORIES—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 292

ROMAN CATHOLIC OPEN-AIR PROCESSIONS—DISTURBANCES AT PECKHAM—Questions, Colonel Sandys and Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answers, Sir M. White Ridley, Mr. Wyndham, and Mr. Goschen 292

UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC CABLE BETWEEN LONDON AND BIRMINGHAM—Question, Sir J. Leng; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 293

SUNDAY DUTY IN THE POST OFFICE—Questions, Mr. Samuel Smith (Flintshire) and Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answers, Mr. Hanbury 293

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT SCHEDULES—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 295

DUBLIN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ART—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 295

June 18.] *Page*

RENT CASES IN COUNTY CLARE—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 296

THE DISSOLUTION—THE PARLIAMENTARY REGISTER—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 296

WELSH SUNDAY CLOSING BILL—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 297

BRITISH MUSEUM—EXTENSION OF BUILDINGS—THE BRITISH MUSEUM BILL—Questions, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) and Mr. J. Morley (Montrose); Answers, Mr. Hanbury and Mr. A. J. Balfour 297

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. Yerburgh; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 298

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to the Public Health (Ireland) Bill 299

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That for the remainder of the session Government business do have precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday (except on Wednesdays the 20th and 27th of June), and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 56 be extended to all the days of the week."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) ... 300
Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet)... 302
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 303
Mr. Courtney (Cornwall, Bodmin) 307
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 307
The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 311
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) ... 315

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'Tuesday,' and insert the word 'Tuesdays' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Tuesday' stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Souttar (Dumfriesshire) 317
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 319
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) 321
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman ... 321
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire) 322
Mr. Tritton (Lambeth, Norwood) 323

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 236; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 145.)

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, after the words 'except on,' to insert the words 'Tuesday the 19th and.'"—(*Mr. Edward Morton.*)

June 18.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 330

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 93; Noes, 250. (Division List No. 146.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That for the remainder of the session Government business do have precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday (except on Wednesdays the 20th and 27th June), and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 56 be extended to all the days of the week.

NEW BILL.

CUSTOMS DUTIES (ISLE OF MAN)—Bill to amend the Law with respect to Customs Duties in the Isle of Man, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hanbury and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer. ... ...

Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill—"To amend the Law with respect to Customs Duties in the Isle of Man," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 250] 333

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1, 2, 3, and 4 agreed to.

Clause 5:—

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 14, to leave out from the word 'Notwithstanding' to the word 'State,' in line 18, both inclusive."—(*Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 341
The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 347
Sir R. T. Reid (Dumfriesshire) 353
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 356
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) ... 359
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 362
Mr. Courtney (Cornwall, Bodmin) 367
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 367
Mr. Maclean (Cardiff) 368
Mr. J. Chamberlain 370

Committee report Progress, to sit again upon Thursday.

Ecclesiastical Assessment (Scotland) Bill [THIRD READING]—Order for Third Reading Read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

June 18.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'now read the third time,' and add the words 're-committed in respect of a New Clause'"—(*Sir Charles Cameron*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'now read the third time' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid*) 372
Mr. J. A. Campbell (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) ... 376

Question put.

The House divided—Ayes, 145; Noes, 55. (Division List No. 147.)

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Birrell (*Fifeshire, W.*) 379
The Lord Advocate (*Mr. A. Graham Murray* (*Buteshire*) 382
Mr. Haldane (*Haddingtonshire*) 383
Sir Mark Stewart (*Kirkcudbrightshire*) 385

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 154; Noes, 61. (Division List No. 148.)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Land Charges Bill [Lords].

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), be now considered."

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid*) 387

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out from the word 'transfer,' to the end of Sub-section 1 of Clause 1."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of Bill."

The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 389

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Robert Finlay 389
Mr. Caldwell 389

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Burial Ground Bills—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 11, after the word 'board,' to insert the words, 'Provided that where any portion of a burial ground is allotted under any Act for the use of any particular religious denomination, the freehold of the same shall remain vested in the burial authority, which shall have the same control over burials therein as in other parts of the burial ground, and the provisions of the Burial Laws Amendment Act, 1880, as amended by this Act, shall apply thereto.'"—(*Mr. Carvell Williams.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

June 18.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Sir M. White Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool*) 394
Sir F. S. Powell (*Wigan*) ... 396
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*) ... 397
Mr. Goddard (*Ipswich*) 398
Sir R. C. Jebb (*Cambridge University*) 399
Mr. Jonathan Samuel (*Stockton*) 399

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Another Amendment proposed—

> "In page 5, line 25, to leave out the words 'first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and one,' and insert the words 'day of the passing thereof' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Carvell Williams.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir M. White Ridley 400

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Land Registry (New Buildings) (Re-committed) Bill—Considered in Committee, and reported, without amendment; read the third time, and passed 401

County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill [Lords]—[SECOND READING]—Order for Second Reading read.

The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 401

Bill read a second time, and committed for Thursday.

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill [Lords]—[SECOND READING]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Price (*Norfolk, E.*) ... 403
The Lord Advocate (*Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire*) 403
Mr. Jonathan Samuel (*Stockton*).. 404

It being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

SUPPLY [15TH JUNE]—Resolutions reported :—

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1900-1901.

CLASS IV.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £5,585,099, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Education, and of the various Establishments connected therewith, including sundry Grants in-Aid."

June 18.] *Page*

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £86,280, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and other Expenses of the British Museum, and of the Natural History Museum, including certain Grants-in-Aid."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,374, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Gallery, and of the National Gallery of British Art, Millbank, including a Grant-in-Aid for the purchase of Pictures."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,520, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Portrait Gallery, including a Grant-in-Aid for the purchase of Portraits."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,967, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Wallace Collection (Hertford House)."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £35,724, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for sundry Grants in aid of Scientific Investigation, etc., and other Grants."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £67,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Grants in aid of the Expenses of certain Universities and Colleges in Great Britain, and of the Expenses under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £5, be granted to her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the University of London."

CLASS V.

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £255,384, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad, and of the Consular Establishments Abroad and other Expenditure chargeable on the Consular Vote."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £167,186, be granted to Her Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Grants in aid of the Expenses of the British Protectorates in Uganda and in Central and East Africa, under the Uganda Railway Act, 1896."

June 18.] *Page*

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £256,955, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for sundry Colonial Services, including certain Grants-in-Aid."

12. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for a Grant in aid of the Revenue of the Island of Cyprus."

13. "That a sum, not exceeding £14,350, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Subsidies to certain Telegraph Companies."

Resolutions agreed to 404

Post Office Sites [Expenses]—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all sums payable by the Postmaster General under any Act of the present Session to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire Lands for the Public Service, and of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect the Provisions of such Acts."—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Whereupon Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Caldwell*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to morrow 406

Executors (Scotland) Bill—Read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc. 407

District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Bill—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Jonathan Samuel (*Stockton*) 407
Mr. Butcher (*York*) ... 407
The Secretary to the Local Government Board (*Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.*) 407

Second Reading deferred till to-morrow.

NEW BILLS.

Jurors' Payment—Bill to regulate the summoning and payment of jurors, ordered to be brought in by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Sir Alfred Hickman, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. M'Ghee, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Emmott, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Mr. Flower, and Mr. Greville.

Jurors' Payment Bill—"To regulate the summoning and payment of jurors," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 2nd July, and to be printed. [Bill 251] 407

Boards of Guardians (Magistrates) — Bill to constitute as ex-officio Magistrates the Chairmen of Boards of Guardians, ordered to be brought in by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Heath, Mr. Galloway, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Mr. Flower, and Mr. Greville.

June 18.] *Page*

Boards of Guardians (Magistrates) Bill—"To constitute as ex-officio Magistrates the Chairmen of Boards of Guardians," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 2nd July, and to be printed. [Bill 252] 407

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve of the clock.

LORDS: TUESDAY, 19TH JUNE, 1900.

The EARL of MORLEY—Sat Speaker.

SAT FIRST—The Duke of Argyll sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 409

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD SPEAKER acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Ilfracombe Improvement; London County Council (Improvements). And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway [H.L.]; Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited [H.L.]. The same were ordered to lie on the Table 409

Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill—A petition of Sir Prior Goldney, Remembrancer of the City of London, praying for leave to present a petition of the Corporation of London praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill although the time limited by Standing Order No. 93 for presenting such petition has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table; and Standing Order No. 93 to be considered on Thursday next in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition... 409

Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 18th and 25th of May last discharged, and Bill committed 409

South Shields Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Reported with Amendments ... 410

North British Railway Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 410

Withington Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]—Reported with Amendments 410

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee without amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next 410

City of London Electric Lighting Bill—Read 2^a, and committed ... 410

Aberdeen Police and Improvement Bill; Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 410

June 19.] *Page*

Latimer Road and Acton Railway Bill—Read 2^a, and committed ... 410

South-Eastern Metropolitan Tramways Bill; East London Water Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 410

City of London (Various Powers) Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 410

Liverpool Corporation Bill—Read 2^a, and committed 410

Wolverhampton Gas Bill—Read 2^a, and committed for Monday next ... 410

London and South Western Railway Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection... 411

Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [H.L.]; Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 411

Salford Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [H.L.]; Preston Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 411

Central London Railway Bill—Read 3^a, and passed 411

Stockport Corporation Tramways Bill; Wakefield Corporation Market Bill—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 411

Ossett Corporation Gas Bill—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 411

Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 411

British Gaslight Company (Staffordshire Potteries) Bill; Lancaster Corporation Bill; Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill; Saint David's Railway Abandonment Bill; West Bromwich Corporation Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners ... 411

Great Berkhampstead Water Bill [H.L.]; Menstone Water (Transfer) Bill [H.L.]; Newport Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 412

Lancashire Inebriates Acts Board Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to. 412

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 412

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND)—Report of the Departmental Committee on Scottish Prisons; with minutes of evidence, appendices and index 412

June 18.] *Page*

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY—Forty-third Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1899–1900 412

BOARD OF EDUCATION (NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION)—General Report for the year 1899, by the Rev. F. F. Cornish, Chief Inspector 412

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA)—Return of all loans raised in India under the provisions of any Acts of Parliament chargeable on the revenues of India outstanding at the commencement of the half year ended on the 31st March, 1900, with the rates of interest and total amount payable thereon, etc. 412

SUPERANNUATION—Treasury Minute dated 30th May, 1900, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the offices of (1) Junior Inspector, and (2) Instructor in the Royal College of Art, Board of Education, South Kensington, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required 412

RAILWAY COMPANIES POWERS ACT, 1864—Report by the Board of Trade on an application made during the year 1899 under the Act, and of the proceedings of the Board of Trade with respect thereto 413

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

EDUCATION—Return of the various Voluntary Schools Associations in England and Wales, with the number of children in average attendance in the schools in each Association, differentiating between rural and urban schools, and showing the total amount of Aid Grant allotted in respect of each class of schools; and further giving the rate of Aid Grant per head of average attendance, and the gain or loss to each Association under the present differential mode of allotment as compared with an allotment of 5s. per child in all schools; ordered to be laid before the House.—(*The Lord Heneage*) 413

Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill—[SECOND READING]. Order of the Day for Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Earl of Hopetoun.*)

Earl Spencer ... ... 413 *The Earl of Hopetoun* 414

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

County Councils (Elections) Act (1891) Amendment Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee 415

Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1:—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 7, to leave out 'between a man and his deceased wife's sister'; and in line 9, after 'possession' to insert 'between a man and his deceased wife's sister, both being domiciled therein.'"—(*Lord James of Hereford.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 110) 415

Land Charges Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 416

Burial Grounds Bill. (No. 111); Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill. (No. 112)—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed ... 416

Land Registry (New Buildings) Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred the Examiners. (No. 113) ... 416

The House adjourned at a quarter before Five of the clock.

COMMONS: TUESDAY, 19TH JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS—SUGGESTED DISTINCTIVE TITLES—On the Order for the Second Reading of a number of Local Government Provisional Order Bills,

Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) ... 416
The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 416
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 417

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill [Annuities]—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the creation of Annuities to be charged on and payable out of the Revenues of India in lieu of the sum of money amounting to £34,859,217 17s. 6d. agreed upon for the purchase by the Secretary of State in Council of India of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, and the payment of any costs and expenses incurred by the said Secretary of State under any Act of the present session for vesting the said undertaking in the said Secretary of State in Council of India; and also any costs, charges, and expenses of obtaining and passing the said Act not provided by the surplus profits arising from the said undertaking for the half year ending the 30th day of June, 1900."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 417
The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) ... 418
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 419
Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) 420
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 420

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the creation of Annuities to be charged on and payable out of the Revenues of India in lieu of the sum of money amounting to £34,859,217 17s. 6d. agreed upon for the purchase by the Secretary of State in Council of India of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, and the payment of any costs and expenses incurred by the said Secretary of State under any Act of the present session for vesting the said undertaking in the said Secretary of State in Council of India; and also any costs, charges, and expenses of obtaining and passing the said Act not provided by the surplus profits arising from the said undertaking for the half-year ending the 30th day of June, 1900.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

British Gas Light Company (Staffordshire Potteries) Bill; Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill; Saint David's Railway (Abandonment) Bill—Read the third time, and passed 421

Lancaster Corporation Bill—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Queen's consent signified. Bill read the third time, and passed 421

West Bromwich Corporation Bill—As amended, considered.

A Clause added.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 421

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Brighton and Preston United District, &c.) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 421

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill—Read a second time, and committed ... 422

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill; Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill—Read a second time, and committed 422

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill—Read a second time, and committed... 422

London (St. Marylebone) Provisional Order—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of a certain area situated in the Parish of St. Marylebone, in the County of London, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley. Ordered, that Standing Order 193A be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the first time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

June 19.] *Page*

London (St. Marylebone) Provisional Order Bill—"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of a certain area situated in the Parish of St. Marylebone, in the County of London," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 253] 422

Railway Bills (Group 7)—Mr. HOLLAND reported from the Committee on Group 7 of Railway Bills, That Mr. Cameron Corbett, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day. Report to lie upon the Table 422

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill; Belfast and County Down Railway Bill—Reported, with Amendments. Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 423

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J)—Colonel GUNTER reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills, That Mr. Coghill, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day. Report to lie upon the Table 423

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP D)—Mr. ALEXANDER HARGREAVES BROWN reported from the Committee on Group D of Private Bills, That Mr. Murnaghan, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present at the sitting of the Committee this day. Report to lie upon the Table 423

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS:—

That they have agreed to—Southport Water Bill, Hastings Harbour Bill, Maidenhead Gas Bill, without amendment. Hoylake and West Kirby Improvement Bill, Southport Extension and Tramways Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Manchester Ship Canal Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Dungannon Gas." Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Barmouth, Brecon, Clacton, Cleckheaton, Hythe, Liversedge, Llandilo, Ramsgate, Romford, and Sandgate." Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, relating to Broughty Ferry, Dunblane, and Wormit and Woodhaven." Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Liverpool Overhead Railway Company to make certain new railways; and for other purposes." Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend and extend the provisions of the Glasgow Police Acts, 1866 to 1899, relating to streets, sewers, and buildings." Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to constitute and incorporate a Joint Water Board consisting of representatives from the councils of the respec-

tive boroughs of Bury, Haslingden, and Rawtenstall, and the urban districts of Radcliffe, Ramsbottom, Little Lever, Whitefield, and Tottington, and the rural district of Bury, all in the county palatine of Lancaster; and to transfer to and vest in such Board the water undertaking of the Bury Corporation; and for other purposes." Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to extend the boundaries of the city of Sheffield; to consolidate certain of the townships within the said city; to empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the said city to construct additional lines of tramways and to execute various street widenings and other works; to make further and better provision for the improvement, health, and good government of the city; and for other purposes." Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Salford to make street improvements, to construct sewers, and to raise additional moneys by mortgage and by the creation and issue of stock, and to make further provisions for the good government of the borough." Salford Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Glasgow District Tramways Company, and to empower that Company to make and maintain Tramways; and for other purposes." Glasgow District Tramways Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company for making works and acquiring lands, and raising and applying capital moneys, and other matters relating to their several undertakings; and for other purposes." Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to alter the numbers and boundaries of the wards of the borough of Preston, and to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the said borough to reconstruct their existing, and to construct additional tramways in and adjacent to the borough; and to make further provisions for the good government of the borough." Preston Corporation Bill [Lords] 423

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]—Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 254] 425

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords]—Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 255.] 425

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [Lords]—Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 256.] 425

Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [Lords]; Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [Lords]; Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills... 425

Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords]; Salford Corporation Bill [Lords]; Glasgow District Tramways Bill [Lords]; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [Lords]; Preston Corporation Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills ... 426

June 19.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

Agricultural Holdings Bill—Petitions from Aberdeen, in favour; to lie upon the Table 426

Dogs Regulation Bill—Petition from Aberdeen, in favour; to lie upon the Table 426

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petitions against, from Lossiemouth Brechin; Peeble; Wishaw; Johnstone; Hawick; Perth; Broughty Ferry; and Dysart; to lie upon the Table 426

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petitions for alteration, from Aberdeen; and Stirling; to lie upon the Table 426

Factories and Workshops Bill—Petitions against, from Fulham; and South Paddington; to lie upon the Table 426

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Arbroath and St. Vigeant; and Glasgow; to lie upon the Table 426

Lunacy Bill—Petition for alteration, from Ticehurst; Petersfield; Fulham; Prescot; and Drayton; to lie upon the Table 426

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Stamford; High Wycombe; Cooling; Lewisham; Morpeth; East Cramlington; Bedlington; Blyth; Shoreham; Lyminster; Choppington; North Sunderland; Swindon; Bebside; Gloucester; Ilkeston; Melbourne; Gretton; Seaton Delaval; Whitley Bay; Lymington; Leighton Buzzard; Lee; Plymouth; Shankhouse; Backworth; Lewes; Wigan; and Newark-on-Trent; to lie upon the Table 426

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions against, from Widnes; St. Helens; Blackburn; Camborne; Bury; Worcester; Cardiff; Bolton; Wigan; and Dundee; to lie upon the Table 427

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Pontypridd; Hammersmith; Tower Hamlets; High Wycombe; Shaftesbury; Penarth; Cardiff (thirty one); Bromsgrove (two); Yardley; Melbourne; Canterbury; Dartford; South Hackney; Broxtowe; Calne; Corsham; Lower Bourne; Nottingham (seventeen); Tyldsley; Blandford; Liversedge (two); Birmingham (three); Wyke; Deptford (two); Whitehaven; Lesmahagow; Pontypool; Bradley; Seaton Delaval; Halesowen; Little Lever; Wortham; Saxmundham; Reigate; Stanwick; Buckhurst Hill; Heckmondwike; Wellingborough; West Brixton; Selby Oak; Bradford (three); Desborough; Aldershot; Buckhurst Hill; Langley Moor; Brixton (two); Throckley; Cilfynydd; Metheringham; Swansea; Kingsbridge; Raunds; Uffculme; Fleckney; Calfaria; Stratford; Lechlade; Newcastle; Flimby; Bath (two); Blackburn; Hackney Road; Wilton; Thatto Heath; Fulham (two); Whitley Bay; Warmley Tower (two); Wycombe; Farnham; Lyminge; Cranlington: Pontesnewynydd; Wandsworth; Balham; Hull; Scottish National Sabbath School Union; Clapton; Newington; Stoke Newington; Lewisham; Hampstead; (three); London; Ringwood; Lymington; Brondesbury; Avonmouth (two); Primrose Hill; Petersfield (two); Redhill (three); Henley-on-Thames; Stoke Newington; Sutton Cornwood; Widnes; Hackney; Kennington; Much Woolton; Frome; Nunney; South Devon; Glasgow (three); Brynmawr (two); Llanelly (two); Builth Wells; Long Compton;

June 19.] *Page*

Ystradgynlais; Stratford-on-Avon (two); Poole; Wellington; Taunton; Paddington; High Wycombe; Liverpool; Barwell; Stamford; Nuneaton; Perth; Kenninghall; St. Austell; Chard; Hay; Wadebridge; Mevagissey (three); West Hampstead; St. Davids; Dundee; Tottenham; Wisbech; Leverington; Murrow; Clerkenwell; Wootton Bassett; Wroughton Road; Stratton St. Margarets; Blunsden; Swindon; Norham; Tweedmouth; Broadmead; Doncaster (two); Glastonbury (two); Street; Somerton (two), Brewham; Langport; Charlton Adam; Keinton Mandeville; Boston; Bitterne; Whitchurch; Lenham; Boughton Morchelsea; Headcorn; Woburn Sands; Leeds (three); Totterdown; Southampton (two); Darlaston; Martock; Newton Abbot; Abercarn; Exeter; City Road; Parkstone; Wookey Hole; Weston-super-Mare (three); Newark; Gerizim; Newport (Mon.); Felixstowe; Yatton; Bamburgh; Seahouses; Williton (two); Llantrissant; Paddington; Bristol (thirty-seven); Christon Bank; North Sunderland; Hyde; Marple; Ilfracombe; Appledore; Fishponds; Maryport; West Bromwich; Devizes; Wanborough; Chiseldon; Wroughton; Lydiard Millicent; Highworth; Rishton; Accrington (nine); Oswaldtwistle (four); Clayton-le-Moors; Huncoat; Forest Gate; Leigh; Upper Stratton; Swindon; Bishopston; Penryn; Gloucester; Heanor; Ripley; Upper Ettingshall; Hitchin; Weare; Stone Allerton; Winscombe; Boulward; Burnham (two); Peterborough (three); Drybrook; Newent; Coleford; Woodbridge; Wednesbury; Dulwich; Newton Moor; Wells (two); Ystradyfodwg; Hornsea; South Newsham; Bolton; Northampton; Wrington; Ashton-under-Lyne; Radcliffe; Keswick (three); Penrith; Caldbeck; Wigton; S^t. John's Wood; Marylebone; Hoyland; Bedford Leigh; Liverpool; Carlisle; Bilston; Allonby (two); Lowton; Thrandeston; Oldham (three); Sowerby Bridge; Mellis Chapel; Grangetown; Liverpool (four); Pant; Norland; Kidderminster (two); Richmond; Yeovil; Hull; Hayfield (two); Tow Law; Chinley; Brynmawr; Cowbridge; Llanfihangel Fechan; Llywel; Priestfield; Llanbedo; Llanfigan; Hoddesdon; Newtown Wigan; Goose Green; Ramsey (Hunts); Lincoln; Stoke-under-Ham; Stithians; Bermondsey; Sunderland (eight); Burrows; Bradford (three); Montacute; Hillcommon; Shankhouse; Brentwood; Trealaw; Ystradyfodwg (three); Pendoylan; Newport; Maindee; Newcastle-under-Lyme; Packmoor (two); Draycott Street; Bishop's Hull; Wellington; St. Lawrence, Ramsgate; Ramsgate (two); New Hirst; Highbury; Widdington Colliery; Horsleydown; Old Kent Road; Wigan (four); Backworth; Paddington; Hollingworth; Westhoughton; Preston; Lye; Sheffield (twenty-two); Netherseale; Wiveliscombe; Morpeth; Cramlington; Bedlington; Bebside; Blyth; Catford; Lee; Blackheath; Lewisham; Baddeley Edge; Farnworth; Liskeard; Huddersfield (four); Berry Brow; Aspatria (two); Cambridge (two); Maryport (three); Hayton; Ellenborough; Harriston; Arlingham; Lidbrook; St. Braviels; Cinderford; Newnham; Blakeney; Crewkerne; Chudleigh Knighton; Dartmouth (three); Kingsteignton; Choppington; Ealing; Little Hallingbury; Selly Park; Brayton; Adsett; Leeds (five); Lewes; Gravesend (thirteen); Northfleet (two); Carlisle Cross; Watchet; and Oswestry; to lie upon the Table 427

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Lochee; Kilmarnock; Fowlis Easter; Liff; Glasgow (three); British Women's Temperance Association; Melrose; Mains; Forfar; Kilmuir Easter; Stonehouse; Galashiels; Selkirk; St. George Lodge of Independent Order of Good Templars; Coldstream; St. Andrew's; Cullicudden; Earlston; Blairgowrie; Edinburgh; Scone; Stanley; Auldearn; Dundee (twenty-five); Rathven; and Innerleithen; to lie upon the Table 429

June 19.] *Page*

Sea Fisheries Regulation (Scotland) Act (1895) Amendment Bill—Petition from Aberdeen, against; to lie upon the Table 429

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS ON ACTIVE SERVICE—Petition from Fulham, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 429

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Newport Pagnell; Melbourne; Netherseale; Canterbury; Heckmondwike (two); Sheffield (five); Norristhorpe; Birmingham (four); Tyldesley; West Brixton; Hawarden; Pontypool; Whitley Bay; Little Lever; Wortham; Saxmundham; Bargoed; Halesowen; Selly Oak; Desborough; Bradford (eight); Seaton Delaval; Throckley; Cilfynydd; Raunds; Calfaria; Stratford; Leicester; Thatts Heath; Cwft; Fleckney; Nottingham; Stoke Newington; South Devon; Lymington; Exeter; Redhill (two); Monson Road; Henley-on-Thames; Much Woolton; Widnes; Brynmawr; Brecknock; Builth Wells; Llanelly; Ynys; Martock; Barwell; Chard; St. Austell; Mevagissey (two); Hay; Kenninghall; Stamford; St. Davids; Hoo; Woburn Sands; Tottenham; Whitchurch; Plymouth; Wisbech; Murrow; Leverington; Wroughton Road; Blunsden; Stratton St. Margarets; Swindon; Berwick; London (four); Doncaster (two); Southampton; Abercarn; Montacute; Mellis; Pendoylan; Ystradyfodwg (two); Shankhouse; Sunderland; Carlisle (two); South Newsham; Marple; Upper Ettingshall; Hollingworth; Newton Moor; Hyde; Westhoughton; Barry; Bolton (four); West Melton; Llwynypia; Felixstowe; Preston; Wigan (five); Devizes; Llywel; Llanbedr; Shoreham; Llanfihangelfechan; Pant; Oswestry; Wrington; Penrith; Keswick; Coldbeck; Wigton (two); Bristol (eleven); Morpeth; East Cramlington; Bedlington Colliery (two); Bebside; Cramlington; Blyth; Parland; Liverpool; Sowerby Bridge; Priestfield; Crewkerne; South Petherton; Bedford Leigh; Catford; Lee; Blackheath; Yardley; West Bromwich; Farnworth; Llanfegan; Oldham (three); Llanfairfechan; Choppington; Arlingham; Lydbrook; Cinderford; Blakeney; Leeds; Shoreham (two); Lewes (two); Paddington; Criston Bank; Bamburgh; Ilfracombe; Barnstaple; Newport (Mon.) (two); Upper Stratton; Chiseldon; Wroughton; Lydiard Millicent; Highworth; Wanborough; Clayton le Moors; Accrington (eleven); Penryn; Falmouth; Gloucester (two); Heanor; Ilkeston; Belston; Hitchin; Peterborough (three); Drybrook; Newent; Coleford; Leigh; Wednesbury; Lowton; Trevithin; Brynmawr; Cardiff; Sea Houses; Wood Green Bamborough; Backworth; Williton; Yatton; Wachet; Pontypool; Yeovil; Blaenavon; Wiveliscombe; Abersychan; Govan; Ramsey; Packmoor; Thrandestone; Calne; Wilton; Bath; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Lechlade; Goose Green; Oswaldtwistle (two); and Richmond; to lie upon the Table 429

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Tyldesley; Pontypool; Llanwono; Llanelly; Builth Wells; Ystradgynlais; Hay; St. Davids; Whitchurch; Abercarn; Cowbridge; Trecastle; Llanfihangel-fechan; Llanfigan; Pendoylan; and Llanbedi; to lie upon the Table 431

Teinds (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 431

Vagrants' Children Protection Bill—Petition of the Association of School Boards of England and Wales, in favour; to lie upon the Table ... 431

June 19.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee on Scottish Prisons, with Minutes of Evidence, Appendices, and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 431

EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA)—Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 31st March, 1900, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 216] 431

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WARNED—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd May; *Sir Francis Powell*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 217] 431

MERCHANT SHIPPING, 1899—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 218] 431

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 219] 431

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY—Copy presented, of Forty-third Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1899-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 432

SUPERANNUATIONS—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 30th May, 1900, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of (1) Junior Inspector, and (2) Instructor in the Royal College of Art, Board of Education, South Kensington, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 432

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Report of Inspectors of Irish Fisheries on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 432

NAVY (EXCEPTIONS TO QUEEN'S REGULATIONS)—Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Queen's Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances during the year 1899-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 432

WHISKY IN BOND (SCOTLAND)—Return ordered, "showing the total quantities of whisky in bond (distinguishing the quantities in general warehouses from the quantities in distillers' warehouses) in each excise collection in Scotland on the 30th day of June, 1900."—(*Mr. Gordon*) 432

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION)—Return ordered, "showing the extent to which, and the manner in which, local authorities in Scotland have allocated and applied funds to the purposes of Technical Education during the year ending 15th day of May, 1900, under the following Acts:—Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890; Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892; Technical Schools (Scotland) Act, 1887; Technical Instruction Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1822; and Public Libraries Acts."—(*The Lord Advocate*) 432

June 19.] *Page*

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—DISASTERS NEAR LINDLEY ON THE 1ST JUNE—Questions, Mr. Butcher (York) and General Russell (Cheltenham); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. J. Powell-Williams, Birmingham, S.) 433

LOST FIELD SERVICE EQUIPMENT—OFFICERS' RESPONSIBILITIES—Question, General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest); Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 433

NUMBER OF BRITISH TROOPS SENT TO SOUTH AFRICA—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams ... 434

MARTIAL LAW—STATISTICS—Question, Mr. John Ellis; Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 435

CASUALTY LISTS—Question, Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.); Answer, Mr. J Powell-Williams 435

NON-DELIVERY OF SOLDIERS' CHRISTMAS PRESENTS—Question, Sir J. Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 435

CODE CABLEGRAMS TO THE CAPE—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 436

ROYAL ENGINEERS AND ARTILLERY PROMOTION REGULATIONS—Question, Mr. C. E. Shaw (Stafford); Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 436

MOBILISATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR HOME DEFENCE—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 437

MILITIA OFFICERS' COMMISSIONS—EXAMINATIONS—Question, General Laurie, Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 437

MILITIA OFFICERS LEAVE OF ABSENCE—Question, Mr. C. E. Shaw; Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 438

COLCHESTER CAMP RIFLE RANGE—Question, Mr. F. W. Wilson (Norfolk, Mid); Answer, Mr. J. Powell-Williams 439

NAVAL MANŒUVRES—Question, Sir Edward Gourley (Sunderland); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 439

INDIAN FAMINE—GRANTS TO NATIVE STATES—PROPOSED PARLIAMENTARY GRANT—RELIEF ORGANISATION—REMISSION OF HOME CHARGES—Questions, Sir William Wedderburn (Banffshire), Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.), Mr. Maclean (Cardiff), and Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 439

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—CAPTURE OF TA-KU FORTS—AFFAIRS ON THE YANG-TSZE—Questions, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester) and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 442

BRITISH SUBJECTS AT PEKING—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 443

June 19.] *Page*

INDIAN TROOPS DESPATCHED TO CHINA—EXPENSES—Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 443

ASHANTI—NATIVE RISING—INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 443

BRITISH SOUTH COAST FISHERIES AND FOREIGN TRAWLERS—Questions, Sir Cameron Gull (Devonshire, Barnstaple) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 444

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK ACCOUNTS—Question, Sir Edgar Vincent (Exeter); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.) 444

POST OFFICE AND TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS ADMINISTRATION—Question, Sir Edgar Vincent; Answer, Sir M. Hicks Beach 445

EDINBURGH POST OFFICE—REVISION OF DUTIES—Question, Mr. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 445

THE SHERIFFSHIP OF ROSS AND CROMARTY—Question, Sir Charles Cameron (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 446

LAND REVENUE RECORDS AND ENROLMENTS OFFICE—Question, Mr. Woods (Essex, Walthamstow); Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 446

HOME OFFICE VOTE—CHIEF INSPECTOR OF FACTORIES REPORT—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answers, Mr. Hanbury and The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 447

TREASURE TROVE AT CARDIFF—Question, Mr. Maclean; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 448

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Dalziell (Kirkcaldy); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 448

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 448

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES)—Mr. Wodehouse reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following fifteen Members in respect of the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill:—Mr. Arnold, Mr. Bond, Mr. Brigg, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir John Dillwyn-Llewelyn, Mr. Dewar, Mr. Howell, Mr. Hozier, Mr. Humphreys-Owen, Mr. William Jones, General Laurie, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Maclean, Mr. Herbert Roberts, and Mr. Alfred Thomas.

Mr. Wodehouse further reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Member from the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons on Municipal Trading:—Sir Leonard Lyell; and had appointed in substitution: Sir John Leng.

Reports to lie upon the Table 448

June 19.] *Page*

SUPPLY [14TH ALLOTTED DAY]—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1900-1.

1. £10,000,000. Transport and Remounts.

DISCUSSION :—

Major Rasch (Essex, S.E.) 449
Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 451
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 452
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) ... 453
Colonel Welby (Taunton) ... 454
Sir Herbert Maxwell (Wigtonshire) 455
The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) ... 457
Mr. Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 460
Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield Central) 461
Captain Norton 465
General Russell (Cheltenham)... 466
Captain Sinclair (Forfarshire)... 467
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 467
Colonel Blundell (Lancashire, Ince)... 468
General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) 468
Mr. Wyndham 468
Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.)... 471

Vote agreed to.

2. £13,100,000, Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies.

DISCUSSION :—

Colonel Welby 472
Mr. Warner 472
Mr. Jeffreys 472
Sir A. Acland-Hood (Somersetshire, Wellington) ... 473
Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S.W.) 473
General Sir F. W. Fitz Wygram (Hampshire, Fareham) 475
Major Rasch 475
Mr. Strachey (Somersetshire, E.) 476
Mr. Wyndham 476
Mr. Jeffreys 479
Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) 479
Colonel Welby 479
General Laurie 479

Vote agreed to.

3. £4,680,000, Clothing Establishments and Services.

DISCUSSION :—

Sir J. Fergusson 480
Colonel Welby 481
Lord Edward Manners (Leicestershire, Melton) ... 481
Mr. Gibson Bowles ... 482
Mr. Wyndham 483
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 486
Mr. Warner 488
Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) 488
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 490
Mr. Scott Montagu (Hampshire, New Forest) 490
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) ... 490
Mr. Wyndham 492
Captain Norton 493

Vote agreed to.

4. £8,000,000, Warlike and other Stores: Supply and Repair.

Discussion :—

Mr. Warner 493
Sir A. Acland-Hood ... 493
Mr. Brown (Shropshire, Wellington) 494
Mr. F. W. Wilson (Norfolk, Mid) 494
Captain Norton 494
Mr. Allan (Gateshead) ... 494
Mr. Wyndham 495
Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth) 496
Mr. Hardy (Kent, Ashford) ... 497
Mr. Wyndham 497

Vote agreed to.

5. £2,670,700, Works, Buildings, and Repairs. Cost, including Staff for Engineer Services.

Discussion :—

Dr. Farquharson 498
Captain Norton 498
Captain Jessel (St. Pancras, S.) 499
Sir J. Colomb 499
Mr. Allan 499
Mr. Wyndham 499
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. J. Powell-Williams, Birmingham, S.) 500
Mr. Allan 500
Dr. Farquharson 501
Colonel Welby 501
Mr. J. Powell-Williams 501

Vote agreed to.

6. £113,800, Establishments for Military Education.

7. £66,900, Miscellaneous Effective Services.

8. £1,611,000, Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers, &c.

Discussion :—

Mr. Boscawen (Kent, Tunbridge) 501
Mr. Allan 502
Mr. J. Powell-Williams ... 502
Mr. Boscawen 503

Vote agreed to.

9. £1,379,000, Pensions and other Non-Effective Charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others.

10. £186,000, Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £63,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Ordnance Factories (the cost of the Productions of which will be charged to the Army, Navy, and Indian and Colonial Governments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901.

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 503
The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 503

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

June 19.] *Page*

CIVIL SERVICE AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900-1901.

CLASS VI.

11. £284,058, to complete the sum for Superannuations and Retired Allowances.

12. £1,800, to complete the sum for Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions.

13. £725, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances.

CLASS VII.

14. £9,452, to complete the sum for Temporary Commissions.

15. £1,370, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Expenses.

16. £1,000, to complete the sum for Paris Exhibition, 1900.

Resolutions to be reported upon Thursday; Committee to sit again To-morrow 504

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill—Question, Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 504

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Balfour*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty minutes before Nine of the clock.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 20TH JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways Bill—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title] 505

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP D)—Mr. Alexander Hargreaves Brown reported from the Committee on Group D of Private Bills, That, for the better securing of a uniform decision with that of the Select Committee on Electric Power Bills, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, the 28th instant, at Twelve of the clock. Report to lie upon the Table ... 505

Rochdale Corporation Bill—Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section (A), with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 505

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petitions against, from Maxwelltown; Greenock; Dunoon; Lanark; and Motherwell; to lie upon the Table 505

Factories and Workshops Bill—Petition from Argyll, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 505

Licensed Premises (Hours of Sale) (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 505

June 20.] *Page*

Lunacy Bill—Petitions for alteration, from Chorley; and Ticehurst; to lie upon the Table 505

Petty Customs Abolition (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Cupar, against; to lie upon the Table 505

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND—Petition from Peebles, against establishment; to lie upon the Table 506

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Worthing; Maidstone; Farnworth: Alnwick (six); Newbery; Belford; Berwick-on-Tweed; Cullercoats; Berkhampstead; Summit; Gateshead-on-Tyne (two); Morpeth; Cromer; Bilston; Whitley Bay (four); Shankhouse; Upholland; Aylsham; Peckham; Cramlington; Eastleigh; Wilby; Whaplode; Glascote; Greenhithe; Tamworth; Fazeley; Stretford; Norwich; Witney; Worthing; Maidenhead; Downham Market; Lancaster; and Helson; to lie upon the Table 506

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions against, from York; Portsmouth; South Somerset; Rhondda Valley; Eccles; North Berkshire; Coventry; Walsall; Northampton (two); Tunbridge Wells; Redditch; Reading (three); and Norwich; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Sheffield (sixty-three); Southampton (twenty-nine); Birmingham (thirty-three); Grimsby (seven); Hirwain; Cleethorpes (two); Penydarren; Clydey; Barnsley (twenty); Wood Green (two); Latchford; Merthyr Tydfil; Lovington; Castle Cary; South Barrow; South Cheriton; Long Sutton; Bristol (ten); Shepton Mallet; Evercreech; Montgomery; Wincanton; Yenston; Govan; Milborne Port; Pilton; Liscard (two); Irthlingboro'; Kettering; Warblington; Long Sutton; Mansfield; Petersfield; Barrow-on-Soar; Letheringsett; Shoreham; Tulse Hill; Herne Hill (four); Mansfield Woodhouse; Wadebridge; Eastwood; Warsop; Sleasley Vale; Irchester; Coseley; Seghill; Whitley Bay (seven); Monk Bretton (four); Low Swithen; Darton; Great Houghton; Gawber; Newcastle-on-Tyne (six); Chadderton (two); North Moor; Heyside; Jarrow-on-Tyne; Hebburn; Spennymoor (two); Hett; East Howle; Stockton-on-Tees; Coxhoe (two); Dartmouth Park; West Bowling; Bradford; Sedgley (two); Bilston (two); Old Buckenham; Littleshall; Wadebridge; Margate (two); St. Peters; Ramsgate (four); Wendling Holt; Cromer; Reading (ten); Greyfriars; Riston; Weybourne; Sunderland (four); Notting Hill; Mansfield; Mareham-le-Fen; Horncastle; Lowestoft; Coningsby; Canterbury; Snaldon; Dawlish; Clay Cross (three); Stepney; Blakeney; George Hughes; Sheringham; Bargoed; North Brixton; Clay-next-Sea; Brixton (three); Lewisham (two); Bolton; Whitwick; Pontypridd; Brockley Road; Deptford; Teignmouth; Newton Abbot (two); Newent; Chelmsford; Gellygaer (three); Llanbedr (two); Penebo; Barmouth; Harlech; Arthog; Dolgelly; Merrington Lane; Bewholme; Hornsea; Derby; Brimington; Woolley; Hetton Downs; Tower Hamlets; Calow; Grassmoor (two); Chesterfield; South Wales; Trefriw; Standish (three); Blyth (two); Winster; West Sleekburn; Newton Hyde; Mount Sorrell; Netherfield; Beddington Colliery; Marlborough (two); Coniston; Wawne; Newport (Isle of Wight); Sutton; Carlisle; Aldershot; Netherton; Platt Bridge; Yeovil; Devizes; Orrell; Chertsey (two); Widnes; Brisley; Wellington; Timsbury; Thorpe St. Matthew; New Catton; Southgate; Eaton St. Andrew; Taunton; Wigan: Shore Edge; Oldham; Manchester; Royton; Withington; Workington; Little Hulton (two); Cockermouth (two); Eighton Banks; Windy Nook; Little Broughton; Wyndham Road; Chorley (five);

June 20.] *Page*

Withnell Mill; Wheelton; Coppull; Brinscall; Adlington; Mountsorrell; Whittle-le-Woods; Euxton; Kelvedon (two); Halstead; Mossley; Maldon; Bocking; Whitwick; Kilmarnock; Stisted; Heyside; Southend-on-Sea; Althorne; Blindcrakes; Aspatria; Thirsk; Bury (three); Alverstoke; Liverpool (three); Basingstoke; Devizes; Coundon Gate; Wellington; St. George's-in-the-East; Battersea (three); Farnworth (three); Lopen; Middleton; Ventnor; Ratcliff; Kearsley; South Hayling; Shankhouse; Woodford; Leyton; Walthamstow; Southsea; Walton-on-Thames; Cromer; Leytonstone (five); Elkington Street; Earsdon; Emsworth; Haslingden; Leicester; Oswaldtwistle; Heywood; Newton Row; Smithy Bridge; Hay Mills; Yardley; Cranleigh; Crabbery Hall; Mapplewell; Shafton; Eastleigh; Halifax; Hoyle Mill; Boldron; Ardsley; Hebburn; Bishop Auckland; Tottington; Rochdale; Epsom; —Middleton; Northampton (two); Shepley; Little Leigh; Wincham; Whitegate; Gateshead (five); Darlington; Baildon; South Monmouth; Moston; Ilkley; New Miller Dam; Barugh (two); Higham; Smithies; Lanner; Middlesbrough (six); Hartlepool; Wolsingham; Pool; Four Lanes; Redruth (four); Portreath; Tolskithy; Camborne (two); Broad Lane; Worsley; Tow Law (two); Egglesburn; Northallerton; Billy Row; West Hartlepool; Stockton-on-Tees; Auckland Park; Saltburn-by-the-Sea; Staindrop; Darlington (six); Stockton-on-Tees (four); Bishop Auckland (two); Guisborough; Carlin How; Beeth; West Hartlepool (two); Whitby; Binchester; Northallerton; Skelton; Margrove Park; Frosterly; Coundon Gate; Evenwood; Middleton-in-Teesdale; Brougham Street; Close House; Shildon North Ormesby; Toronto; Deri; Whitby; Old Shildon; New Shildon; Howden-le-Wear; Eston; Thirsk; Stockton; Rawmarsh; Rotherham (four); Topsham; Fivehead; North Petherton; Bridgwater (two); Ilminster; North Curry; Midgley; Stafford; Warminster; Great Somerford (two); Sherston Magna; Seagry; Cleverton; Malmesbury; Hullavington; Garsdon; Hetton Downs; Newcastle; Rochester; Oakley; Broadwell; Bourton-on-the-Water; Attercliffe; Tetbury; Cirencester (two); Bledington; Newport (Mon.); Skewton Magna; Brighton; Carlton; Bolton; Leeds (thirty-two); Exeter (two); Burnt Hill; Quick's Green; Glasgow; Andover; Easton; Workington; Hunslet; Roundhay; Brighton; Lancaster; Clapton; Stratford; Brixham (two); Alnwick (four); Belle Vale; Nelson; Blaenavon; Garndiffaith; Abersychan; Bilton; Cwmbach; Coventry; Windsor; Llanfihangel Gobion; Lower Clapton; Shotley Bridge; Westwood; Blackhill; Annfield Plain; Soham (four); Milkwell Burn; Newbury; Pontypridd (two); Liverpool; Hougham; Ashton-in-Makerfield; Bradwell; Buxton; Wokingham; South Croydon; Plymouth; Great Berkhampsted (two); Hallow; Worcester; Croydon (sixteen); Thornton; Berkhampsted; Heath; Compstall; Torquay; Plymouth; Ulverston; Yeadon (two); Stockcross; Abercarn (two); Buchan; Cartmell; Paisley; Mynyddislwyn; Alnwick; Norton; Aldershot; Stockport, Burley; High Wycombe; Portsmouth; Wellingborough; Clerkenwell; Yorkston; Great Yarmouth (five); Ireby; Carnforth; Beal; Morecambe; Lancaster; Waterloo (two); Askam-in-Furness; Clitheroe (three); Slaidburn; Downham (two); Colne (three); Keswick; Percy Main; Sawley; Chatburn (two); Harrop; Swarth Moor; Slaidburn; Darnall (four); Endcliffe Park (two); Dalton-in-Furness; Attercliffe; Helson; Briercliffe (two); New Cullercoats; Wortley (three); Wednesbury (three); Barrowford (two); Micheldever; Barley; Darlaston; Leabrook; Tipton; Ecclesfield; Oxford; Cheltenham; Horsforth: Wortley (two); Holbeck; Chesham; Bladon; Armley (two); Bramley; Peasedown; Bolton (two); Bletchington; Murcott; Heath Town; Wolverhampton; Rhymney; Long Handborough; Berwick-on-Tweed (two); Hammersmith; Witney; Oswestry; Bradley; Whitehaven; St. Mawes; Wanstead; Barking; Helston; Manfield; Griffithstown; Manor Park (two); Heckmondwike; Oswaldtwistle; Westbourne; Chatham (eight); Lambeth; Grove; Accrington; Boxmoor;

June 20.] *Page*

Clayton-le-Moors; Carneddan; Standford Hill; Egremont; Petersfield; Lindford; Liphook; Holybourne; Alresford (two); Baybridge; Swaffham; Bolton-le-Moors; Bracknell; Neckalls (two); Wimbledon; Causeway Green; Wishaw; Toxteth Park; Powerby; Walsham-le-Willows; Stratford New Town (two); Little Lever; Hampstead; Maidenhead; Enfield (four); Faversham (three); Heckmondwike; Lynton; Lambeth; Silloth; Longtown (two); Carlisle; Dalston; Cumwhinton; Carlton; Norwood (four); Brampton; Street; Glastonbury; Onslow Square; Thornton Heath (two); Snodland; Heywood; Bispham; Hopwood; Pendleton; Billinge; Barnstaple (four); Bodmin; Bideford; Penoletory; Callington; Worcester; St. Cleer; Common Moor; Somerton; Mytholmroyd; Welford; Wilbarston; Great Harwood (three); Stowmarket; St. Pancras; Haydock; Addiscombe; Blackburn; Earlstown; Seppard; Wattisfield; West Felton; Weirbrook; Perkins Beach; Shrewsbury; Dorrington; Clapham Road; Heeley; Liverpool (four); Edmonton; Stratford-on-Avon; Cotham Grove; Redland; London; Lordship Lane; Hull (six); Stoneferry; Cannock; Ashbrittle; Milverton; Brighouse (four); Bishopston; Kimbolton; Tamworth (three); Brislington; Crawshawbooth (three); Furness Vale; Compstall; Chelmorton; Flagg; Whitewynch; Holbeach (two); Spalding; Little London; Weston Hills; Lutton; Moulton Leas End; Holbeach Bank; Whaplode; Gedney Drove; Kettlebrook; Lewes; Rastick (two); Clifton; Worcester; Quarry Bank (two); Dudley (three); Red Hill; Roadwater; Birch's Coppice; Chaceterrace; Norton Canes; Brownhills; Norton East; Cradeley Heath (two); Brierley Hill; St. Luke's; Wakefield; Lichfield; Kingsbrompton; Horley; Lumb; Airdrie; Pontyberem; Queensborough; Acocks Green; Springside; Cloughfold; Whitwell Bottom; Newchurch; Walsall Foleshill; Reigate; Griffith C. Owen; Fishponds; Maidstone (two); Downfield; Porlock; Barrow-in-Furness; Gosford; Belford; Rushcliffe; Faringdon; East Hagbourne; Park Corner; Wallingford; Bressingham; Meadow Hall; West Ham (three); Pontgwyn; Bardwell; Ramsbottom; Coventry (two); Fareham (two); Falmouth; Hackney (two); Canning Town (three); Plaistow (two); Stratford; Brixham (three); South Hackney; Hinderclay; Harwood; Beenham; Yallendon; Whitehaven; Thetford; Blackburn; Chesham; Hampstead; Downham Market; Hoxton (three); Windsor; Bayswater; Bardon Park; Ashby-de-la-Zouch (two); Coate; Paddington; Old Street; Kidlington; Tranmere; Summertown; Griffithstown; Stoke Ferry; Aylesbury; Brookfield; Nottingham (three); Topsham; Brighton; Golborne; Earlestown (two); Newton-le-Willows; Brynn; Ashton-in-Makerfield (two); Saltley; Middleton-by-Wirksworth; Heckmondwike; Stafford; Great Wakering; Oatlands; Littletown (two); Hightown; Clown; Widnes; Poolsbrook; Marsden Moor; Staveley; Dronfield; Cradley; Hayes Lane; Hindley; Bradford; Pontypridd; Nuneaton (four); Ashton-under-Lyne; Fulham (two); Pemberton; Lendall; Broughton; Llandilo; Darlington; Walthamstow (eight); South Woodford (three); Woodford Green (two); Chingford; Bridlington (three); Biggin; Diss (three); Minchinhampton; Woodton; Burston; Stroud; Burnham; Weston-super-Mare (two); Reading (three); Peckham (two); Nunhead; Cramlington; Seaton Delaval; Laisterdyke; Wisbech; Foxhole; Combe (two); St. Austell (three); Mount Charles; Glensplat; Amersham; Colnbrook; Ferryhill; Tudhoe; Barkby; Syston; Belgrave; Leicester; Thurmaston; Melton Mowbray; Havant; Greenock; Helmshore; Woodford; Ystrad; Treorchy; Ystradyfodwg (five); Leyton; Croxdale; Merthyr Tydfil; Norwood; Trimwood Colliery; Haswell; Plymouth (two); York; Three Towns; North Walsham; Hickling; Potter; Heigham; Weston; Dilham; Neath; Swansea; Shipley; Queensbury; Bakewell; Ashbourne; Brook and Wye; Hathersage; Winchester (two); New Brighton; Brixham; South Norwood; Milton; Ecclesfield (two); Selhurst; Newcastle-under-Lyme; Great Harwood;

June 20.] *Page*

Greenborough; Barrow-in-Furness; Old Radford; Old Lenton; Sheerness (eleven); Great Totham; and Norwich (fifty-nine); to lie upon the Table 506

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Scotland Bill—Petitions against, from Keith; Brechin; Paisley; Arbroath; Edinburgh; Partick; Pollokshaws; Airdrie; Montrose; Dunfermline; Stirling; and Falkirk; to lie upon the Thble.

Petitions in favour, from Edinburgh; Dundee (five); Glasgow; Dumfries; Jedburgh; Kilarron; Kilchoman; Falkirk; Stornoway; and Logiewester; to lie upon the Table 511

Shop Hours Acts Amendment Bill—Petition of the Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table 511

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Coundon Gate; Northampton; Shepley; Boldron; Farnworth (four); Bishop Auckland; Leicester; Todmorden (two); Tottington (two); Heywood (three); Smithy Bridge; London (four); Birmingham (thirteen); Walthamstow; Leyton; Woodford; Earsdon; Shankhouse; Heyside (two); Shore Edge; Little Hulton; Kearsley; Radcliffe; Wellington; Althorne; Gateshead (six); Blindcrake; Maldon; Whitwick (two); Adlington; Euxton; Chorley (four); Wheelton; Coppull; Brinscall; Withnell Mill; Manchester; Eighton Banks; Wyndham Row; Cockermouth (two); Workington; Royton; Little Broughton; Thirsk; Liverpool; Wigan; Wellington; Brisley; East Cowes; Winster; Hyde; Blyth; Morpeth; Standish; Sutton; Coniston; Wawne; Bewholme; Hornsea; Mount Sorrell; Merrington Lane; Spennymoor; Sheringham; Stepney; Wangford; Lowestoft; Govan; Sheffield (twenty-eight); Notting Hill; Riston; Weybourne; Cley-next-Sea; Margate (two); Old Buckenham; Oswaldtwistle (two); East Howle; Jarrow-on-Tyne; Hebburn Colliery; Coxhoe; Hett; Hebburn; Newtown-on-Tyne; Chadderton (two); Spennymoor; Glodwick; Oldham; North Moor; Trefriw; Ashington and Hirst; Bilston (two); Stockton-on-Tees; Sedgley; Barrow-on-Soar; Grimsby (four); Aberdare; Montgomery; Latchford; Barnley; Clydey; Horncastle; Wincanton; Mareham-le-Fen; Coningsby; South Barrow; Long Sutton; Horsington; Shepton Mallet; Evercreech; Pilton; Lavington; Seaforth; Macclesfield; Tetbury; Tisbury; Chedworth; Calne; Cirencester (two); Cwm-y-gaist; Oakham; Stockport (two); Deal; Ely; Stretton Westwood; Chippenham; Knaresborough; Hibaldstow; Whiteparish; Westhoughton; Dundee (two); Sunderland; Warsop; Pleasley Vale; Mansfield; Nuncargate; East Kirkby; Truro; North Brixton; Cradley Heath (two); Brockley Road; Newton Abbot; Berwick-upon-Tweed (two); Bradley; Whitehaven; St. Mawes; Helston; Griffithstown; Clayton-le-Moors; Watford; Heckmondwike; Rishton (two); Accrington; Long Eaton; Percy Main; Letheringsett; Ilfracombe; Bodmin; Callington; Saltash; Welford; Haydock; Paisley; Great Harwood (two); Stowmarket; Earlestown; Wilbarston; Wattisfield; West Felton (two); Lyth Hill; Dorrington; Carneddan; Wanstead; Barking; Manor Park; Chatham; Bardwell; Upton Park; Holybourne; Peppard; Moseley Road (two); Selhurst; Milom; Oxford; Meadow Hall; Stanton St. John; Cassington; Aberguile; West Ham Park; Canning Town (two); Plaistow; Yattendon; Thetford; Chesham; Goole; Maidstone (five); Farringdon; Walsall; Hinderclay; Abingdon; Wakefield; Redhill; Ashton-under-Lyne; Minehead; Ramsbottom; Queenborough; Llandarrog; Reigate (two) ; Springside; Cloughfold; Newchurch; Whitewell Bottom; Crawshawbooth (two); Sittingbourne; Rawtenstall (four); Bressingham; Barrow-in-Furness; Tamworth (four); Brighouse; Hull (six); Warton (two); Glascote; Chaste-

June 20.] *Page*

terrace; Norton Canes; Norton, East Dulverton; Porlock; Cannock; Flagg; Chelmorton; Whitehough; Spalding; Holbeach Bank; Holbeach (two); Gedney Drove End; Little London; Cullercoats; Dalton-in-Furness; Aldershot; Wellingborough; Beal; Cartmel; Ulverston; Dartmouth (three); Dawlish; Chelmsford; Harlech; Newton Abbot; Dudley (three); Quarry Bank (two); Gelligaer; Llanbedr (two); Birch's Coppice; Barmouth; Arthog; Dolgelley; Bontddu; Colne (two); Clay Cross (three); Woolley; Lwarth Moor; Timsbury; Unity Tent, Order of Rechabites; South Wales; East Croydon (five); Glossop; Buxton; Compstall; Worcester; Thornton Heath (two); Hallow; York; Chipping Norton; Mynyddislwyn; Abercarn; Yeadon; Burley-in-Wharfedale; Portsmouth; Gorleston; Great Yarmouth (four); Southsea; Bolton (six); Morecambe; Harrop; Leeds (five); Plymouth; Nelson; Manor; Attercliffe; Clitheroe; Barrowford (three); Barley; Wednesbury (three); Tipton; Darlaston; Southfield; Armley; New Wortley; Holbeck; Lower Wortley; Wolverhampton; Street; Glastonbury; Snodland; Onslow Square; Aylesford; Walsham-le-Willows; Rochdale; South Norwood (two); Faversham; Pendleton (two); Buckland Brewer; Thornhillhead; Bideford; Ashton-in-Makerfield; Lynton; Holt; Lutton; Bath; Kimbolton; Westfield; Newcastle-under-Lyme (two); Melindior; Lleckryd; Aberystwyth; Llanbadarn Lower; Bledington; Milton Lodge; Sherston Magna (two); Corsham; Marylebone; Monmouth (two); Blackwood; Broadwell; Freshwater (three); Warminster; Ormskirk; Malmesbury; Seagry; Lea; Great Somerford (two); Gardsdon; Hullavington; Brightside; Grimesthorpe (two); Acocks Green; Platt Bridge; Abram; Hindley; Lamberhead Green; Greenock; Melksham; Levenshulme; Upton; Kingsbrompton; Liverpool; Bristol; Swanwick; Bacup; Collingham; Ferndale; Ringley; Little Hulton (three); Bourton-on-the-Water; Mickleaver; Bedwellty (four); Houghton-le-Spring (two); Sheerness; Belvedere: Moses Gate; Audlem; Ashton; Worthing; Moulton Seas End; Waterhouse (two); Pemberton; Hayes Lane; Cradley; Hindley; Orrell; Darlington; Greet; Yardley; North Petherton; Birmingham (eleven); Liverpool (two); Rochdale; Little Leigh; Wincham; Whitegate; Over; Middlewich; Baildon; Ilkley; Aberdeen; Redruth; Lanner; Brea; Camborne; Illogan; Rotherham; Morsley Mesnes; Hetton Downs (two); Stow-on-the-Wold; Oakley; Matlock Bank; Topsham; Earlestown; Newton-le-Willows; Brynn; Ashton-in-Makerfield; Stubshaw Cross; Saltley; Clown; Middleton-by-Wirksworth; Southend-on-Sea; Great Wakering; Heckmondwike; Littletown (two); High Town; Manchester (two); Dronfield; Poolsbrook; Marsden Moor; Staveley; Widnes (two); Platt Bridge; Merthyr Tydfil; Pontypridd (seven); Landilo; Bradford (two); Ashton; Cromer; Northampton; Nottingham (three); Walthamstow (four); Woodford Green; Ystrad; Croxdale; Trimdon Colliery; Haswell; Biggin; North Walsham; Hickling; Potter Heigham; Freemantle; Neath; Martham; Shipley; Bakewell; Norwood; Kirk Ireton; Thorne; Kimpton (two); Hulland; Ashbourne; Patrick; Stroud; Burston; Woodton; Weston-super-Mare; Reading (two); Nunhead; Peckham; Cramlington Village; Seghill; Tywardreath; Combe; Greensplat; Foxhole; Laisterdyke; Ipswich; Amersham; Ferryhill; Tudhoe; Barkby; Syston; Belgrave; Thurmaston; Leicester; Melton Mowbray; Great Harwood; Helmshore; Dumfries; Newchurch; Stroud; Minchinhampton; Threeburrows; Trewartha; Cheltenham; Southwark; Buckley; Rhyndwyclydach; Llansamlet Higher (two); Llansamlet Lower; Gowerton; Liscard (two); Marylebone; Newcastle-under-Lyme; Andover; Greenborough; Sheerness (three); Old Lenton; Sheffield (fifteen); Barrow in Furness; Chapel in the Field; Market Harborough; Dowlais (two); Merthyr Tydfil (three); Vaynor; Aberdare; Baddesley Ensor; Bistre Buckley; Old Radford; Willington; Titney Fen End; Marshland Smeeth; Ryhope; Faringdon; New Ferry; Birkenhead (three); New Brighton; Heswall; Sanghall; Seacombe; East Haybourne; Aylsham; Easthorne; Brenton; Carlton; Hucknall Torkard; St. Thomas; Exeter (three); Repton; Little Over; Plymouth; Dilham; St. Helens; Hemington; Twerton-on-Avon; Radstock; Llandovery; Burry Port; Llandilo; Myddfai; Hastings; Treforest (two); Brightmet; Bolton (two); Enfield; Llanwonno; Ryburgh; Gately; Appleby; Windermere; South Petherton; Tryddyn (two); Ffynnongroew; Soham (four); St. Austell; Irby; Heeley; Darnall; Blackburn; Cheltenham; Croydon (seven); Bradwell; Annfield Plain; Easton; Quicks Green; Burnt Hill; Workington; Hunslet; Belford; Alnwick; Dewsbury; Belle Vale; Garndiffaith; Abersychan; Blaenavon; Gellygaer; Weston Hills; Llanquicke (two); Westwood; Blackhill; Milkwell Burn; Shotley Bridge; East Hedley Hope; Yardley; Micheldever; Bracknell; Swaffham; Baybridge; Sowerby; Norwood; South Norwood (two); Alresford; Nelson; Ancoats; Glasgow; Causeway Green; Walsham-le-Willows; Thornton Heath; Forest Gate; Longtown (two); Silloth; Dalston; Carlisle; Cumwhinton; Faversham (two); Tranmere; Kidlington; Summerstown; Griffithstown; Sutton; and Great Yarmouth; to lie upon the Table. 511

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Llansamlet Lower; Cwmbach (two); Clydey; Aberdare; Llanbedr; Pontypridd; Merthyr Tydfil (four); Llandilo; Llansamlet; Rhyndwyclydach; Llansamlet Higher (two); West Glamorgan; Dowlais (two); Vaynor; Myddfai; Treforest (two); Pontypridd (four); Gelligaer; Rhydfelan; Llanwonno; Bedwellty (two); Brynmawr; Dyffryn; Goginan; Aberystwyth; Pontyberem; Pantgnyn; Mynyddislwyn; and Rhymney; to lie upon the Table 515

VIVISECTION—Petition from Notting Hill, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table 515

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS—Copy presented, of Report of the Chief Inspector for 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table... 515

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—Copy presented, of Twenty-seventh Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 515

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1898. Part I. Criminal Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 515

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, appointing Bangor, County Down, an additional place of Examination for Boys [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 516

BOARD OF EDUCATION (GENERAL REPORTS) — Copy presented, of General Report for the year 1899 by the Chief Inspector of the North-Western Division [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 516

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—

1. Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham).—Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 220].

2. Arundel Port.—Copy of Annual Report and General Account of the Commissioners of Arundel Port for period from 25th March, 1899, to 25th March, 1900 [by Act] 516

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill—As amended, considered.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) 518
Mr. William Johnston (Belfast, S.) 519
Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) ... 519
The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 520
Mr. Tomlinson (Preston) ... 521

Question put, and agreed to.

An Amendment made.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

Mr. Banbury 521

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 522
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 523

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 26; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 149.)

Original Question put, and agreed to. Bill read the third time, and passed.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill—Order for consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 525
Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S.W.) 526
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) ... 527
The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Long, Liverpool, West Derby) ... 529
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.)... ... 531
Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 532
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) ... 535
Mr. Tomlinson (Preston) ... 537
Mr. Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) 537
Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.) 539

Question put, and agreed to. Bill considered

June 20.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, to leave out the word 'workman,' and insert the word 'labourers' instead thereof."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'workman' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Grant Lawson 544

The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) ... 545

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out from the word 'by' to the word 'Act,' in line 10, inclusive, and insert the words 'any employer who habitually employs for hire one or more workmen in such employment.'"—(*Mr. Goulding.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the occupier' stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S.W.) 548
Mr. Moulton (Cornwall, Launceston) 548
Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.)... 548
Commander Bethell (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) 548
Mr. Cripps (Gloucestershire, Stroud) 549
Sir Robert Finlay 549
Mr. S. T. Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) 549
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 550

Question put, and negatived.

Remaining words omitted.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'habitually.'"—(*Mr. Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'habitually' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Long 551
Mr. Radcliffe Cooke (Hereford) 552
Mr. Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 552
Commander Bethell 554
Sir Robert Finlay 554

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 150.)

Mr. Lloyd-Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.) 557
Sir Robert Finlay 557

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'for hire.'"—(*Mr. S. T. Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'for hire' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

June 20.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Jeffreys (*Hampshire, N.*) 558
Mr. Fenwick (*Northumberland, Wansbeck*) ... 558
Sir Robert Finlay 559
Mr. Galloway 559
Mr. John Wilson (*Durham, Mid*) 559
Mr. Long 559
Commander Bethell 560
Mr. Loyd (*Berkshire, Abingdon*) 560

Question put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'in such employment.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Long 561

Question put, and agreed to.

Words, as amended, inserted.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of Clause 1, to add, '2. Where any such employer agrees with a contractor for the execution by or under that contractor of any work in agriculture, Section 4 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, shall apply in respect of any workman employed in such work as if that employer were an undertaker within the meaning of that Act. Provided that where the contractor provides and uses machinery for the purpose of threshing, ploughing, or other agricultural work, he, and he alone, shall be liable under this Act to pay compensation to any workman employed by him on such work.'" —(*Captain Pretyman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Long 563
Mr. Gibson Bowles ... 563
Mr. Moulton 563

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"Clause 1, page 1, line 10, after 'Act,' insert 'Where any workman is employed by the same employer mianly in agricultural but partly or occasionally in other work, this Act shall apply also to the employment of the workman in other work.'"—(*Sir C. Welby.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Long 565
Captain Sinclair 565

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, after the word 'land,' to insert the words 'or premises.'" —(*Mr. Cawley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or premises' be there inserted."

Mr. Long 566
Mr. Soames (*Norfolk, S.*) ... 567

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

June 20.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 14, to leave out 'and the like.'"—(*Sir Cameron Gull.*)

Mr. Long 567

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 1, page 1, leave out from beginning of line 15 to 'agriculture,' in line 16."—(*Sir Cameron Gull.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'agriculture,' to insert the words—'A workman employed in agriculture shall not be excluded from this Act by reason only that the accident arose outside the farm or premises of his employer in the course of his work.'"—(*Captain Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Long ... ... 568 *Captain Sinclair* 568

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'agriculture,' to insert the words, 'The expression "average weekly earnings," in the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, shall, for the purpose of this Act, be deemed to mean six times the workman's average daily wage during his employment with the employer in whose service he shall sustain personal injury by accident, although he may not have been so employed for a period of two weeks prior thereto.'"—(*Mr. Goulding.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Long 569
Mr. John Wilson 570
Mr. H. S. Foster (*Suffolk, Lowestoft*) 570

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Title amended.

Bill to be read the third time on Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 257.]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Mr. Grant Lawson (*Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk*) 570

It being half-past Five of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday next.

Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill—Considered in Committee, and reported, without amendment; read the third time, and passed ... 571

Intoxicating Liquors (Local Veto) (Ireland) Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 571

District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Bill—Read a second time, and committed for To-morrow 571

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE—Seventh Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 571

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—CAPTURE OF THE TA-KU FORTS, ETC.—On the Motion for Adjournment:—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 572

Adjourned at Twenty minutes before Six of the clock.

LORDS: THURSDAY, 21st JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—St. Albans Water, London and North Western Railway (Wales), Devonport Corporation. The same were ordered to lie on the Table 573

Dorking Water Bill [H.L.]; Fishguard Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Menstone Water (Transfer) Bill [H.L.]; Newport Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 573

Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill [H.L.]; Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]—Read 2^a 573

Bradford Corporation Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 573

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 573

Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 573

Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill—Standing Order No. 93 considered (according to Order), and dispensed with, with respect to a petition of the Corporation of London. Leave given to present the said petition 574

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]—The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendment 574

Morecambe Urban District Council (Gas) Bill—Reported from the Select Committee without Amendment 574

Market Weighton Drainage and Navigation Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 18th and 25th of May last discharged; and Bill committed 574

Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways Bill; Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 574

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 116) 574

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill—Read 2^a (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next 574

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow 575

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Petersham) Provisional Order Bill—Read 2^a (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow 575

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRAINING COLLEGES—Reports on training colleges for the year 1899, by W. Scott Coward, Esq., the Hon. Mrs. Colborne, and Sir John Stainer; list of training colleges under inspection... 575

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—Twenty-seventh Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department 575

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND)—Eighteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1899: Part III. Scientific investigations ... 575

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND)—Part I. Criminal Statistics for the year 1898 575

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—Annual Report of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, for the year 1899 575

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT)—Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1899, by the Hydrographer 575

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE OBSERVATORY—Report of the Astronomer at the Cape of Good Hope Observatory to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, for the year 1899 575

June 21.]

Page

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP—Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, for the year 1899 576

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES)—No. 527. Agricultural and other natural resources of Tripoli. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 576

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION — Statement of the estimated income and expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation for 1900–1901 576

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877—Account of receipts and payments under the Act during the year ended 31st March, 1900 ... 576

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND)—1. Rules and programme of examinations for the year 1901; 2. Rules made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing Bangor, county Down, an additional place of examination for boys in 1900; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 576

ARUNDEL PORT—Account and Report for 1899-1900. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie upon the Table 576

PETITIONS.

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill—Petition in favour of; of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; read, and ordered to lie upon the Table 576

STATUE OF OLIVER CROMWELL, AT WESTMINSTER—Petition for the removal of; of persons signing; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 577

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—Message from the Commons for leave for the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House. Leave given accordingly, and a message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith 577

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill. [No. 114]; Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill. [No. 115]; brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and to be printed 577

Volunteers Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Lord Monkswell 577
The Secretary of State for War (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 577
The Earl of Kimberley 578

Clause 2 agreed to.

Other clauses agreed to; Bill reported without amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

Military Lands Bill—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 :—

Moved—

> "In Clause 1, page 1, line 8, to leave out 'by or on behalf of a Volunteer corps.'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 1, page 1, line 9, to leave out from 'and' to 'may' in line 11, and to insert 'for this purpose.'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 3 :—

Moved—

> "In Clause 3, page 2, line 4, after 'purposes' to leave out to the end of the clause and insert 'the regulations contained in the Schedule hereto as to the confirmation and otherwise of the resolution mentioned in this section shall apply in the same manner as if they were re-enacted in the Act.'"—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 580
The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) ... 580
Lord Monkswell... 581
The Earl of Kimberley 581

On Question, their Lordships proceeded to a division.

On the question being again put the Amendment was negatived.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 582

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4, 5, and 6 agreed to.

Moved—

> "To insert as a new clause, after Clause 6 :—'(1.) In the application of this Act to Scotland the following provision shall have effect—(*a*) The expressions "council of any urban district" and "council of any urban district other than a borough" shall mean the commissioners of a police burgh; (*b*) the expression "Public Health Acts" shall mean The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, provided that the limit of rate imposed by that Act shall not apply to any rate authorised by this Act; (*c*) the expression "hire" shall mean "take on lease"; (*d*) references to the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, and to Section 25 and Sub-sections (2) to (4) and (7) to (9) of Section 26 thereof shall be substituted for references to the Local Government Act, 1894, and to Section 9 and Sub-sections (2) to (5) and (8) to (10) thereof respectively; (*e*) a reference to Sub-section (8) of Section 25 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, shall be substituted for a reference to Sub-sections (1) and (5) of the Local Government Act, 1888; (*f*) in Section 6 of this Act the expression "Local Government Board" shall mean the Local Government Board for Scotland. (2) In Sub-section (9) of Section 25 of the Military Lands Act, 1892, "twenty-one" shall be substituted for "twenty-two."'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, new Clause agreed to.

Clause 7 agreed to; Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be reprinted as amended. (No. 117.)

June 21.] *Page*

Uganda Railway Bill [Second Reading]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read,

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

The Earl of Kimberley ...	586	*The Marquess of Salisbury*... ...	587

On Question agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House to-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

The Cromwell Statue.

Discussion :—

The Earl of Hardwicke ...	588	*Lord Morris*	595
The Marquess of Salisbury...	592	*The Earl of Kimberley*	597
The Earl of Halsbury ...	595	*The Earl of Hardwicke*	598

G.P.O.—Transfer to Mount Pleasant—Postal Rearrangements, Delays, Etc.

Question, Earl Stanhope; Answer, The Postmaster-General (The Marquess of Londonderry) 598

Hours of Labour in Shops—Question, Lord Avebury; Answer, The Marquess of Salisbury... 601

Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill [h.l.]—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow 602

House adjourned at Twenty-five minutes past Six of the clock.

COMMONS: THURSDAY, 21st JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill—Order [22nd March], That the Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill be committed to the Committee to be nominated by the Committee of Selection for the consideration of other Private Bills relating to electric power, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the order be discharged."—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Discussion :—

Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) ...	603	*The Chairman of Committees (Mr. J. W. Lowther, Cumberland, Penrith)*	603

Question put, and agreed to.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill [Annuities] (By Order)—Resolution reported :—"That it is expedient to authorise the creation of Annuities to be charged on and payable out of the Revenues of India in lieu of the sum of money amounting to £34,859,217 17s. 6d. agreed upon for the purchase by the Secretary of State in Council of India of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, and the payment of any costs and expenses incurred by the said Secretary of

State under any Act of the present session for vesting the said undertaking in the said Secretary of State in Council of India; and also any costs, charges, and expenses of obtaining and passing the said Act not provided by the surplus profits arising from the said undertaking for the half-year ending the 30th day of June, 1900."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) ... 604
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 604
The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 604

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill, that they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*).

Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill—Read the third time, and passed 605

Cowes Pier Bill [Lords]—Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 605

Great Central Railway Bill [Lords]; Motherwell Water Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 605

Dublin Corporation Bill and Clontarf Urban District Council Bill (Joint Committee)—Ordered, That Frederick C. Pilkington do attend the Joint Committee on the Dublin Corporation Bill and the Clontarf Urban District Council Bill on Monday next, at half-past Eleven o'clock 605

West Ham Corporation Bill—Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section B), with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 606

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—Central London Railway Bill, without Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Stockport Corporation Tramways Bill, Wakefield Corporation Market Bill, Ossett Corporation Gas Bill, Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Lancashire Inebriates Acts Board Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passsed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Abergele Gas, Irthlingborough Gas, Littlehampton Gas, Lymington Gas, Mablethorpe and Sutton and Romford Gas." Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords] .. 606

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 263] 606

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill read the third time, and passed 606

PETITIONS.

Coal Mines (Prohibition of Child Labour Underground) Bill—Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table 607

County Councillors (Qualification of Women) (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table 607

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Kilmarnock, against; to lie upon the Table 607

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petitions against, from Cullen, Fraserburgh, Banff, and Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland; to lie upon the Table 607

Factories and Workshops Bill—Petitions against, from Shoreditch, and Enfield; to lie upon the Table 607

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Dunfermline, in favour; to lie upon the Table 607

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act (1854) Amendment Bill—Petition, from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table 607

Land Values Taxation (Scotland) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Kilmarnock; and Dundee; to lie upon the Table 607

Licensed Premises (Hours of Sale) (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table 607

Licensing Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table 607

Local Authorities Officers' Superannuation Bill—Petition from Erith, in favour; to lie upon the Table 608

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894); Amendment Bill—Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table 608

Lunacy Bill—Petition from Birmingham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 608

Petty Customs Abolition (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Linlithgow, against; to lie upon the Table
Petition from Dunfermline, in favour; to lie upon the Table 608

Rating of Woodlands—Petition from West Ham, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table 608

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Romford; Swindon; Walsingham; Ploughfield; Sandbach; Norwich; Morpeth; Kempston; Bampton; Caerphilly; Boston; Houghton-le-Spring; Broadwindsor; Stourbridge; Brighton; Wolverhampton; Ruckhall; Dorstone; Shenmore; Cagebrook; and Powchurch; to lie upon the Table 608

June 21.]

Page

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions against, from Torquay; and Darlington; to lie upon the Table

Petitions in favour, from Watchet; Tettenhall Wood; Winchester (five); Ossett; Stockport; Rochester; King's Lynn; Clungunford; Croydon; Swindon (two); Hebden Bridge; Porthleven; Llorney; Lewisham; Withnell Fold; Caerphilly; Salford (two); South Hiendley; Royston; Shivemoor; Portishead; Hersham; Jarrow; Sutton; Bedford (two); Andover; Macclesfield; Bampton; Pontypridd; Chelmsford; Nailsea; Exmouth; Morley; Ampthill; Kempston; Maulden; Biggleswade; Shillington; Bratton Fleming; Morley; Land Key; Langridgeford; Leicester; Wigston Magna; Loddiswell; Tiverton; Llandrindod Wells; Llangunllo; Mirfield; Bradford (three); Pontnewynydd; Penybont; Bideford; Abbotsham; Longridge; Walsall; Newchurch; Morpeth (two); Cranborne; Langton; Heckington Fen; Sleaford; Cornsay (three); South Moor; Dulwich; Walsall; Penge; Hull (eight); Blackburn; Edinburgh; Walsingham; Aspatria; Maryport; Folkestone (three); Norwich; Bristol; Mansfield Woodhouse; Upper Parkstone; Walton (three); Atherstone; Longford; Hampstead Road; Warrington; Ore; Tolmer Square; Stoneferry; Aldeburgh; Clayton le Moors; Rishton; Little Hulton; Moseley Road; Ferndale; Hythe; Littlehampton; Bridgwater; Bedwellty (two); Brixham; Jarrow; Rugeley; Sutton-in-Ashfield; Houghton-le-Spring; Worthing; Dulverton; Ringley; Greenhithe; Dartford; Monmouth; Collingham; Llanbadarn Lower; Radcliffe; Sheerness; Pontywain; Little Lever; Maidstone (five); Pontypridd; Thorne Branch; Kimpton; Bristol (eleven); East Kirkby (two); Weston-super-Mare; Minehead; Belvedere; Mansfield (four); Pleaseley; Pleaseley Hill (two); Liverpool; Isle of Wight; Atherstone; Hull (four); Small Heath; Guilden Morden; Nuncargate; Norwich; Platt Bridge; Lamberhead Green; Bacup (three); Winfarthing; Ince; Fersfield; Hindley; Abram; Fareham; East Bridgford; Liverpool; Ashley Down; Moses Gate; Little Hulton; Upton; Rawtenstall (two); Levenshulme; Rastrick; Blairgowrie; St. Pancras; Brighouse; Truro; Chapel Ashton; Audlem; Chester; Clotton; Whitegate; Bedminster; Wellington; Swanwick; Belper; St. Kilda; Jarrow-on-Tyne (five); Farnworth; Nuneaton; Radcliffe-on-Trent; Blackwood; Stow; Freshwater (three); Aughton; Great Lever; Sheffield (fifteen); Bingham; Newcastle-under-Lyne (two); Llwynadda; Aberystwith; Bath; Nunney; Westfield; Fulham; Totterdown (six); Ryndwyclydach; Llansamlet Higher (two); Llansamlet Lower; Gowerton; Llanguicke; St. Albans (two); Willington; Cheltenham; Waterfoot; Stroud; Threeburrows; North West Ham; Murton Colliery; Liscard; Branksome; Marylebone (two); Clapham Junction; Newent; Kingswood (three); Stratford; Market Harboro'; Baddesley; Atherstone (three); Bistre; Buckley; Woodborough; Old Basford (four); Bulwell; Ryhope (two); Petworth; Marshland; Faringdon; East Hagbourne; Irby; Rossendale; Mount Tabor; New Feary; New Brighton; Heswall; Great Saughall; Birkenhead; Seacombe; Liscard; Egremont (two); Reading (three); Aylsham; Notting (three); Appledore; Oldbury; Darwen; Ilfracombe; Barnstaple; Prenton; Eastham; Beeston; Arnold; Daybrooke; Rushcliffe; Finchley Road; Ipswich; St. Thomas; Exeter (two); Hatfield; Bristol (four); Repton; Mickleover; Littleover; Middlesborough Langtoft; Bridlington; Ashby-de-la-Zouch; Plymouth; Buckfastleigh (four); Bawell; Markham; Bury; Bulmer; St. Leonards (two); Cefncoedycymer; Merthyr Tydfil (twelve); St. Helens; Holywell Green; Burslem; Hampstead; Okehampton; Wilby; Single Hill; Streatham; Llandoxery; Burry Port; Llandilo; Slingsby; Coneystorpe; Silverhill; Amotherby; Kirkheaton; Women's Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Society; Bolton (two); Caerphilly; Treforest (two); Abercynon; Pontypridd (three); Rhydfelen; Enfield; Llanwonno; Darwen; Westburn;

Hampstead; Bressingham; Gateley; Little Ryburgh; Appleby; Troutbeck Bridge; Kentish Town (three); North Lopham; Weston-super-Mare; Bath; Hemington (two); Frome; Wellow; Single Hill; Tiverton-on-Avon; Radstock; North Petherton; Tryddyn (two); Ffynnongroew; Ystradyfodwg (two); Williams Town; Llwynypia; Birkenhead; New Brompton (two); Bolton; Rawmarsh; Rotherham; Gwyrsyllst; Fulham (two); London; Sleaford; Mexborough; Okeford Fitzpane; Luton; Romford; Hull (two); Honley; Houghton-le-Spring; Tewkesbury Abbey; Rumbold; Hastings; Sturminster Newton; Boston; Brixham; Wolverhampton; Sharpness; Pembroke Docks; Leeds; Child's Hill; Southampton; New Brompton (two); Camberwell; Dunstable; Herne Hill; Widnes (four); Sleaford; Huddersfield; Nottingham (nine); Hale Bank; St. Day (two); Hayle; Goonbell; Camborne (two); Willesden (three); Piddletrenthide; Llanedy; Harlesden; Portesham (two); Abbotsbury (two); Whitby; Ilford; Sawbridgeworth; Rotherham; East Ham; Blandford; Sherborne; Great Stanmore; Stalbridge; Marnhull; Harlesden; Hendon; Winterborne Kingston; Sturminster Newton; Okeford Fitzpaine; Ibberton; Birmingham (three); Dodworth; Romford (three); Broadwindsor; Skipton; Yetminster; Derby (two); Ambleside; Peterborough; Brighton (five); Kirkby Lonsdale; Casterton; Hove; Toddington (two); Kendal; Leighton Buzzard; Kilbirnie; Cricklewood; Worcester; Little Ilford; Hull; Harold Wood; Crane Moor; Ruabon; York (five); Birdwell; Worsboro' Bridge; Worsboro' Common; Silkstone Common; Sharpenhoe; Thurgoland; Cullen; Whitby (two); Hornchurch; Finchley Lane; Luton; Wychbold; Birdwell; New Barnet (seven); Burtle; Bridgwater (three); Minehead; Stourbridge; Barlborough; Aspley Guise; Calverley; Stratton St. Margarets; Dronfield; Beighton; Lydiard Tregooze; Sheffield (two); Preston; Staveley; Shaw; Dewsbury; Leek (four); Bradley Green; Lancaster and Cheshire Working People; Camden Road; Manchester; Cheetham Hill; Heath Town; Wolverhampton (two); Nottingham (five); Cotgrave; Hockley (two); Cheadle; Devonport; Stonehouse (two); Stoke; Boston (seven); Sutterton; Leek; Butterwick; Aspley Guise (two); Wadebridge; Leeds; Luton; Barton; Toddington; Romford (sixteen); Newquay; Cheetham Hill Road; Chester (four); Palin Street; Barnton; Norley; Shurlack; Rathy; Mevagissey; Kingstone; Vowchurch; Ploughfield; Didley; Ruckhall; Dorstone; Shenmore; Coventry (two); Walsall; Chasetown; Burntwood; Stockport (two); Morley; Newbattle; New Invention; Knighton; Wakefield; New Lampton; Upper Parkstone; Poole; Wareham; Carlisle; Southsea; Cagebrook; East Dulwich; Troedyraur; Great Grimsby (two); Pudsey; Egremont; Cheshire; Sulcoates; Clay Cross; Great Driffield; Wimborne; Filey (two); and Kingswood; to lie upon the Table 608

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions against, from Kirkcaldy; and Kilsyth; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Bothwell; Lesmahagow; Kirkcaldy; Dysart; Carsphairn; Swinton; Kingarth; Peebles; Elgin (two); Callander; Dunnichan; Dundee (five); Glasgow; Kelvinside; Lochee; Dalziel; and Govan; to lie upon the Table 611

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill, and Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petition in favour, from Bath; and Maidstone; to lie upon the Table 611

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill; Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill; and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petition from Worcester, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

June 21.] *Page*

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Rotherham; Rawmarsh; Llwynpia; Gwersyllt; Drighlington; Sleaford; Okeford Fitzpaine (two); Luton (four); Ibberton; Hull; Upton Park; Tewkesbury Abbey; Sturminster Newton (two); Honley; Hastings; Rumbold; Boston (two); Evesham; Sharness; New Brompton; Dunstable; Poole; Sleaford (two); Widnes (three); Nottingham; St. Day (two); Hayle; Goonbell; Childs Hill, N.W.; Willesden (two); Llanedy; Portesham (two); East Ham; Birmingham (two); Teddington (three); St. Pauls; Broadwindsor; Kildwick; Abbotsbury (two); Kendal; Brighton (two); Hove; Kinning Park; Brentwood; Southampton; York (three); Cricklewood; Wadebridge; Mount Charles; St. Austell (two); Charlestown; Wolverhampton (five); Hook; Stratton St. Margarets; Manchester (five); Shaw; Purton; Buckland Newton; Piddletrenthide; Whitby (five); Blandford; Sherborne; Stalbridge; Marnhull; Winterbourne; Derby; Tebay; Ambleside; Peterborough; Casterton; Kirkby Lonsdale; Romford; Ruabon; Little Ilford; Burtle; Puriton; Minehead; Stourbridge; Bridgwater; Barlborough; Sheffield (three); Staveley; Dewsbury; Aspley Guise; Biddulph; Bradley Green; Cheadle: Stoke; Sharpenhoe; Packmoor; Oldbury; Darwen; Sutterton; Boston; Butterwick; Swineshead Bridge; Polgooth; Newquay; St. Blazey; Fowey; Carlisle; Edinburgh; Croydon; Ibstock; Withnell Fold; Swindon; Tiverton; Porthleven; Llanquicke; Knighton; Lloiney; Nailsea; Fenton; Sutton; Pontnewynydd; Talymain; Arlesey; Portishead; Chelmsford; Bedford (two); Loddiswell; Biggleswade; Shillington; Maulden; Langridgeford; Barnstaple; Kempston; Leicester; Wigton Magna; Llandegley; Ampthill; Wakefield; Tettenhall Wood; Newchurch; Morpeth; Langton Maltravers; Poole; Wareham; Cranborne; Heckington Fen; Hulme; Eastwood; Great Driffield; Blackburn; Bradford (three); Norwich; Shaldon; Ratby; Chesterton; Maryport; Southwark; Filey; Aldeburgh; Walton; Chester (three); Radford; Nottingham; Shurlach; Barnton; Stanningley; Pudsey; Bewdley; Calverley; Nelson (three); Bradley; Roughlee; Clayton-le-Moors; Southfield Barley; Reedyford; Egremont: Sandbach; New Invention; Chasetown; Burntwood; New Lambton; Morley; Stockport; Hylton; Teignmouth; Garndiffaith; Bath; Mevagissey; Kingstone; and Didley; to lie upon the Table ... 612

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Llwynypia; Llanedy; Bridgend; Troedyrawr; Llandegly; and Caerphilly; to lie upon the Table 613

Teinds (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Dunfermline, in favour; to lie upon the Table 613

Temperance Reform Threefold Option (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Longringgend, in favour; to lie upon the Table 613

VIVISECTION—Petition from Hull, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table ... 613

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY IN THE PROVINCES (CONTRIBUTIONS IN LIEU OF LOCAL RATES)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 23rd February; *Sir Albert Rollit*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 221.] 613

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY (COUNTY OF LONDON)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 23rd February; *Sir Albert Rollit*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 222.] 613

June 21.] Page

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877—Account presented, of the Receipts and Payments under the Act during the year ended the 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 223] 613

BOARD OF EDUCATION (TRAINING COLLEGES)—Copy presented, of Reports relating to Training Colleges for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 614

NAVAL WORKS—Copy presented, of Statement showing the total estimated cost of each work, the estimated expenditure thereon to 31st March, 1900, and the amount available to meet expenditure in 1900–1901, together with the expected date of completion [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 614

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION—Copy presented, of Statement of the estimated Income and Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation for the year 1900–1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 224.] 614

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896—Copy presented, of Two Orders, Nos. 6,092 and 6,106, dated respectively the 16th May and 16th June, 1900, revoking certain Orders of the Board relating to the Landing of Foreign Animals [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 614

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1900–1901)—Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 28th May; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 225.] 614

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES)—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 527 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 614

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*) 614

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*) 615

LOCAL TAXATION (ENGLAND) ACCOUNT 1899-1900—Return ordered, "showing, in respect of the financial year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, the distribution of the proceeds of the Local Taxation, Licences, Estate Duty, and Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Duties paid into the Local Taxation (England) Account in pursuance of the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1888, the Finance Act, 1894, and the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 301, of Session 1899)."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*) 615

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—LORD ROBERTS'S PROCLAMATION ANNEXING THE ORANGE FREE STATE—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamsptonhire, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 615

June 21.] *Page*

MARTIAL LAW—TREATMENT OF CAPE REBELS—Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain... 615

MEDICAL TREATMENT OF SOLDIERS ON FURLOUGH—CASE OF PRIVATE MITCHELL—Questions, Sir Edward Gourley (Sunderland), Mr. Marks (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 616

2ND BATTALION WILTSHIRE VOLUNTEERS—CASE OF JOHN KING—Questions, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade), Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 617

VOLUNTEER CAMPS OF INSTRUCTION—OFFICERS' COMMAND PAY—Question, Mr. Lees Knowles (Salford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 619

PROMOTIONS FROM THE RANKS—Question, Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 619

BRIGADE SIGNALLING OFFICERS PAY—Question, Mr. Hudson (Hertfordshire, Hitchin); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 620

IMPERIAL PENNY POSTAGE—EXTENSION TO ORANGE RIVER COLONY AND THE TRANSVAAL—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 620

DECEASED OFFICERS' WAR MEDALS—Question, General Laurie (Cheltenham); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 620

SALISBURY PLAIN MANŒUVRES—COMMISSARIAT BREAKDOWN—Questions, Mr. Holland (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley), and Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 621

POST OFFICE VOLUNTEERS—CAMP LEAVE—Question, Colonel Dalbiac (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 622

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT CASUALTIES—Questions, Mr. Channing and Sir J. Fergusson; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 622

GENERAL STAFF AT ALDERSHOT—Question, Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 623

VOLUNTEER CAMPS—MEDICAL OFFICERS—Question, Mr. Billson (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 624

MACHYNLLETH RIFLE RANGE—Question, Colonel Pryce-Jones (Montgomery Borough); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 624

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE—Question, Sir William Wedderburn (Banffshire); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 624

INDIAN FINANCIAL STATEMENT—Question, Sir William Wedderburn; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 625

AFGHANISTAN—PROHIBITION OF TRADE WITH INDIA—Question, Mr. Maclean (Cardiff); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 625

INDIAN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—Question, Mr. Maclean; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 626

June 21.] *Page*

INDIAN BUDGET—Questions, Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. Maclean; Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 626

TURKISH GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS—ENGLISH TENDERERS—Question, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 626

RAILWAYS IN ASIA MINOR—RUSSIAN CONCESSIONS—Question, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 627

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN DISTURBANCES—RECENT OPERATIONS—TIENTSIN AND PEKING—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 628

COMMAND OF THE BRITISH FORCES IN CHINA—CO-OPERATION OF JAPAN WITH THE EUROPEAN POWERS—Questions, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett and Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 628

LEAD POISONING—RETURNS—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White Ridley, Lancs., Blackpool) 629

CLERK OF THE PEACE FOR STAFFORDSHIRE—Question, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent); Answer, Mr. White Ridley 630

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION IN THE CHANNEL ISLANDS AND THE ISLE OF MAN—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 630

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS—Question, Mr. Woods (Essex, Walthamstow); Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 631

SCOTTISH TRAINING COLLEGES—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A Graham Murray, Buteshire) ... 631

SLOUGH RAILWAY ACCIDENT — Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 633

LIVERPOOL CENSUS RETURNS—Question, Sir John Willox (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Chaplin, Lincolnshire, Sleaford 633

G.P.O.—TRANSFER TO MOUNT PLEASANT—POSTAL REARRANGEMENT DELAYS, ETC.—Questions, Mr. Henniker Heaton and Mr. Maddison (Sheffield, Brightside); Answers, Mr. Hanbury 634

BRITISH MUSEUM—ANNUAL RETURN—Question, Sir Henry Howarth (Salford, S.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 634

IRISH GOLD ORNAMENTS—TREASURE TROVE—Questions, Mr. J. Morley (Montrose Burghs), and Mr. Stanley Leighton (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answers, Mr. Hanbury and Mr. A. J. Balfour 635

KILLYLEA NATIONAL SCHOOL—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds Central) ... 635

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. William Johnston (Belfast, S.), Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 636

June 21.] *Page*

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRADE, ETC. — Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., have leave to sit this day till Four o'clock during the Sitting of the House.—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*) 636

Agricultural Holdings Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 226.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 226.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 258.] 637

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND)—The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 637

Bill to amend Sections 42, 51, 54, 56, 57, 69, 103, 115, and 121 of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and Articles 19, 24, and 36 of the Schedule to The Local Government (Application of Enactments) Order, 1898, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

Local Government (Ireland) Bill—"To amend Sections 42, 51, 54, 56, 57, 69, 103, 115, 121 of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and Articles 19, 24, and 36 of the Schedule to The Local Government (Application of Enactments) Order, 1898," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 259.] 637

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IRELAND (NO. 2)—Mr. G. W. Balfour 637

Bill to provide for the alteration of the Local Government (Procedure of Councils) Order, 1899, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill—"To provide for the alteration of the Local Government (Procedure of Councils) Order, 1899," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 260.] 638

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND)—Mr. G. W. Balfour 638

Bill to amend the Poor Relief (Ireland) Acts, 1838 to 1892, with respect to relief given by the maintenance of lunatics and children, and with respect to the quantity of land which may be acquired under those Acts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill—"To amend the Poor Relief (Ireland) Acts, 1838 to 1892, with respect to relief given by the maintenance of lunatics and children, and with respect to the quantity of land which may be acquired under those Acts," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 261]. 638

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 5 :—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, to leave out from the word 'Notwithstanding,' to the word 'State,' in line 18, both inclusive."—(*Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

DISCUSSION :—

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.*)... 639
Mr. Haldane (*Haddingtonshire*) 642
Mr. Maclean (*Cardiff*) ... 645
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 646
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) ... 647
The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay* (*Inverness Burghs*) ... 647
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) ... 651
Mr. Haldane 653
Mr. J. Chamberlain 654

Question put, and negatived.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, to leave out from the word 'Act,' to the end of line 23." —(*Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 656
Sir Robert Finlay 656

Question put, and negatived.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Schedule :—

Amendments made.

Mr. Maclean 657
Mr. J. Chamberlain 657

Schedule and Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and printed. [Bill 262.] Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 658

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL—[THIRD READING]—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'now read the third time,' in order to add the words 're-committed in respect of Clause 19.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

June 21.] Page

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.)	661
The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham-Murray, Buteshire)	662
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs)	663
Mr. Colville (Lanarkshire, N.E.)	664

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 214 ; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 151.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Elementary Education Bill [SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months' "—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Goddard (Ipswich) ...	671
Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.)	671
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.)	672
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.)	674
Mr. Stuart (Shoreditch, Hoxton)	675
Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade)	676
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs)	678
The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University)	678
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) ...	680

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Money-Lending Bill [Lords]—[SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

June 21.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Maclean (*Cardiff*) ... 698
Mr. Warr (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 702
Mr. Vicary Gibbs (*Hertfordshire, St. Albans*) ... 706
Mr. Bayley (*Derbyshire, Chesterfield*) 708
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 710
Mr. Steadman (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 713
Mr. Gedge (*Walsall*) ... 714
The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) ... 716
Mr. Murnaghan (*Tyrone, Mid*)... 719
Mr. H. S. Foster (*Suffolk, Lowestoft*) 720
Mr. Lyttleton (*Warwick and Leamington*) 727
Mr. Hazell (*Leicester*) 729
Major Rasch (*Essex, S.E.*) ... 730
Mr. Maddeson (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 731

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned"—*Mr. Marks*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Inebriates Amendment (**Scotland**) **Bill** [Lords]—Order read, for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [18th June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate resumed.

It being midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next 734

POST OFFICE SITES [EXPENSES]—Considered in Committee.

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all sums payable by the Postmaster General under any Act of the present session to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire lands for the Public Service, and of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect the Provisions of such Act.—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next 734

County Courts (**Investment of Deposits**) **Bill** [Lords]—Considered in Committee.

Clause I. :—

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next 734

District Councillors and Guardians (**Term of Office**) **Bill**—Considered in Committee, and reported, without amendment; to be read the third time upon Monday next 735

Education of the Blind (**Scotland**) **Bill**—Read a second time, and committed for Monday next 735

June 21.] **Page**

Registration of Firms Bill (Select Committee)—Ordered, That Mr. Hazell be discharged from the Select Committee on the Registration of Firms Bill.

Ordered, That Mr. Mendl be a Member of the Committee.—(*Mr. William M'Arthur*) 735

G.P.O.—TRANSFER TO MOUNT PLEASANT—POSTAL RE-ARRANGEMENTS, DELAYS, ETC.—On the motion for adjournment—Questions, Mr. Egerton (Cheshire, Knutsford) and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 735

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve of the clock.

LORDS: FRIDAY, 22ND JUNE, 1900.

SAT FIRST.—The Viscount Clancarty (*E. Clancarty*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 737

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Farnworth Urban District Council; Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas, and South Metropolitan Gas Companies; Halifax Corporation; Huddersfield Corporation Tramways; Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply; Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway; Lambeth Water; London and Saint Katherine Docks and East and West India Dock Companies; Mid-Kent Water; Portland Urban District Gas; Southport and Lytham Tramroad; Wandsworth and Putney Gas. Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 1). And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have not been complied with:—South Metropolitan Gas; Metropolitan District Railway. The same were ordered to lie on the Table 737

Roe's Patent Bill [H.L.].—Presented (pursuant to leave given this day), and read 1ª 737

South Metropolitan Gas Bill; Metropolitan District Railway Bill—Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday next 738

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Petition for Roe's Patent Bill ought to be dispensed with, and leave given to introduce the Bill. That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Petition for the Alexandra Park Bill ought to be dispensed with. Read, and agreed to 738

Great Northern Railway Bill.—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 3rd and 28th of May last discharged; and Bill committed 738

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 738

June 22.] *Page*

Hamilton Burgh Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 738

Ilfracombe Improvement Bill; London County Council (Improvements) Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 738

North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Walsall Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 738

Cowes Pier Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 738

Motherwell Water Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 739

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]—(Bootle Corporation, Radcliffe Urban District Council, and St. Helens Corporation Orders *opposed*) 739

Tramways Order Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]—(Batley Corporation, Camborne and Redruth, East Ham Urban District Council, Hull Corporation, Portobello and Musselburgh, and Southampton Corporation Orders *opposed*) 739

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]—(Garstang and Warrington Corporation Orders *opposed*). Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.: D. Northumberland (chairman); M. Camden, E. Lindsey, V. Frankfort de Montmorency, L. Saye and Sele; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Wednesday next, at Eleven o'clock, and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 739

Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—Ordered that Standing Orders Nos. 72 and 82 be suspended for the remainder of the Session ... 739

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made: Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next 739

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed 739

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed 740

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Petersham) Provisional Order Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next 740

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Electric Lighting Acts 1882 to 1890 (Proceedings)—Report by the Board of Trade respecting the applications to and proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1890, during the past year 740

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 and 1896—Two Orders, Nos. 6092 and 6106, dated the 16th ultimo and 16th instant respectively, revoking certain Orders of the Board relating to the landing of foreign animals. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table 740

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.]—Report from the Select Committee (with proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. [No. 119.] Bill reported, with Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next; and to be printed as amended. [No. 118] 740

Land Charges Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments to be printed. [No. 120] 740

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Thursday next.—(*The Lord James of Hereford.*) [No. 121] 740

Committee of Selection for the Standing Committee—Report from, That the Committee have added the Lord Kinnaird to the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Report from, That the Committee have added the Viscount Frankfort de Montmorency to the Standing Committee for the consideration of the Military Lands Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 741

Uganda Railway Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived. Then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to Order), and dispensed with. Bill read 3^a, and passed 741

Reserve Forces Bill—[Second Reading]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Discussion:—

Lord Monkswell 741
The Secretary of State for War (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 741

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

Military Manœuvres Bill [H.L.]—Read 2^a (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next 742

Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill—[Third Reading]—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal.*)

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 742

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 3^a accordingly, and passed, and sent to the Commons ... ...

Imitation of County Court Process Bill [H.L.]—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read 742

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

The Lord Chancellor of Ireland (*Lord Ashbourne*) 743

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Earl of Denbigh.*)

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next 743

House adjourned at quarter before five of the clock.

COMMONS: FRIDAY, 22ND JUNE, 1900.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW, ETC.—Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, have leave to sit this day during the Sitting of the House.—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*) ... 744

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill [Lords] (by Order).—Order for Third Reading Read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'That this House declines to proceed with a private Bill specially exempting one Foundation from the State control imposed by the general law upon all Charitable Foundations, including the Universities and Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge.'"—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Bond (*Nottingham, E.*)	747
Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*)	749
Mr. Grant Lawson (*Yorkshire N.R., Thirsk*) ...	752
Mr. Lowe (*Birmingham, Edgbaston*)	754
Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) ...	757
The First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*)	758
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) ...	760
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.*)	761
Mr. J. A. Pease (*Northumberland, Tyneside*)	763

The House divided :—Ayes, 170; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 152.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

June 22.] *Page*

STANDING ORDERS—Ordered, That so much of Standing Order 91 as fixes Five as the quorum of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be read, and suspended.

Ordered, That for the remainder of the Session Three be the Quorum of the Committee.—(*Mr. Halsey*) 765

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 765

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered on Monday next 766

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]—Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 766

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 767

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 767

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill—Reported, without amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time on Monday next 767

London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 767

London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 767

London County Council (Money) Bill—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table... 767

Brewery and Commercial Investment Trust Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time 767

Cumberland County Council (Bridges) Bill—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 767

Scottish American Investment Company, Limited, Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time 767

Falkirk Corporation Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 768

Milford Docks Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time 768

Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time 768

South Eastern Railway Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 768

Taff Vale Railway Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 768

Rhymney Railway Bill [Lords]; Cork Electric Tramways Bill [Lords]; Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed... 768

Bristol Water Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. Bill to be read the third time ... 768

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill [Lords]; Wirral Railway Bill [Lords]; Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed... 768

Glasgow and South Western Railway Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 768

Bray and Enniskerry Railway Bill; Tottenham Urban District Council Bill—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 768

Message from the Lords—That they have agreed to—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill, without Amendment.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Dorking Water Bill [Lords], Fishguard Water and Gas Bill [Lords], Menstone Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords], Newport Corporation Bill [Lords], Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Great Grimsby Street Tramways Company, with respect to the construction and working of Tramways in the borough of Grimsby and for other purposes." Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer upon the Corporation of Ramsgate further powers with reference to the local government and improvement of the borough; and for other purposes." Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the North British Railway Company to construct certain new railways, widenings, and other works; to confer further powers upon the Company and upon other Companies in connection with their respective undertakings; to amalgamate the Aberlady, Gullane, and North Berwick Railway Company, the Newport Railway Company, and the Eyemouth Railway Company with the Company; to transfer to and vest in the Company the undertaking of the Borrowstounness Harbour Commissioners; to enable the Burntisland Harbour Commissioners to borrow and the Company to advance them further money; to authorise the Company to enter into working and other agreements with the Invergarry and Fort Augustus Railway Company; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes." North British Railway Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to empower the Corporation of Walsall to construct tramways; to extend their powers in regard to their gas undertaking; to make further provision in regard to financial matters; and for the improvement of the borough; and for other purposes." Walsall Corporation Bill [Lords].

Public Accounts.—That they give leave to the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend in order to his being examined as a witness before the Select Committee appointed by this House on "Public Accounts." 768

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords]; Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [Lords]; North British Railway Bill [Lords]; Walsall Corporation Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 770

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Paisley, against; to lie upon the Table 770

Factories and Workshops Bill—Petition from Walworth, against; to lie upon the Table 770

Land Registry (New Buildings) Bill—Petition from Lee, against; to lie upon the Table 770

Local Authorities Officers' Superannuation Bill—Petitions in favour, from Bromley, and Beckenham; to lie upon the Table 770

London Borough Councils (Women's Disabilities Removal) Bill—Petition from St Mary, Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table ... 770

Petty Customs Abolition (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Dumfries, in favour; to lie upon the Table 770

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND—Petition from Bournemouth, against establishment; to lie upon the Table 770

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Uckfield; Burgess Hill; Eastbourne (two); Brighton (two); Bradford; Newhaven; Newburn; Deal; Lymington; Gosport; Luton; Henley-on-Thames; Ashington; Greenhead; Hexham; Horsham (two); Newbiggin-by-the-Sea; and Birkenhead; to lie upon the Table 770

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions against, from East Berks; and Loughborough to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Portsmouth; Tunbridge Wells; Southport (nine); Dover (two); Northampton; Dowlais (thirteen); Croydon (four); Herne Bay; Camberwell (two); Elham; Snainton; Sherburn; East Ayton; Brampton; Scarborough (five); Seamar; Crosby; Southmolton (two); New Tredegar; Wath; Burgess Hill; Littlehampton; Llanelly (twenty-three); Birkdale; Crossens; Stockport; Pudsey; Padiham; Hackney; Clapham Road; Trawden; South St. Pancras (seven); Ainsdale; Earlestown; Liverpool; Waterloo (two); Aymestry; Leintwardine; Adley Moor; Wigmore; Hayle; Forest of Dean; St. Clether; Week; St. Mary; Tresmeer; Boyton; Altarnon; St. Gennys; Warbstow; Watford; Harrogate; Brighton (three); Tresparrett; Maxworthy; Treneglos; Poundstock; Jacobstow; Bury; Luckwell Bridge; Wood

June 22.]

Page

Green; Bicester; Tyersal; Edmonton; Norwich; Measham; Weston-super-Mare: Sevenoaks; Southampton (four); Redruth; St. Breward; Copthorne; Launceston; Stratton; St. Michaels; Darwen; Smethwick (two); Handsworth (three); Whittle Brook; Patricroft (two); Flixton; Little Hulton; Eccles (two); Swinton; Pendlebury; Birmingham (two); Burnley (six); Mereclough; Calverley; Pudsey; Nomansland; Widnes (three); Lymington (two); Fordingbridge (two); Seagrave; St. Helens (two); Sutton Oak; Bishop's Waltham; Ponder's End; Garston; St. Asaph; Mossley Hill; Old Kent Road; Wandsworth; Balham Grove; Shortlands; Bromley (two); Sheffield (five); Witham; Whiston; Maldon; High Barnet; Bute; Braintree; Loughton (five); Peterborough (two); Langstone; Wootton-under-Edge (two); Charfield; Gosport; Gloucestsr; Burnham; Shipham; Beaufort; Cwm; Victoria; Porthcawl; Seaforth; Kennington, Islington; Weston-super-Mare; Aberystwyth; Battersby Junction; Eye; York; Adisham; Shoreham; Portslade; Southern Cross; Wisbech (two); Bolney; Newburn; Scotswood; South Norwood (two); Walbottle; Saltburn; Sengdale; Newby; Stokesley; Darnall; Bedford College; Atherton (two); New Brompton; Pudsey (two); Southminster; Leigh; Sparkbrook; Small Heath; Cerne Abbas; Lyme Regis; Bowbridge; Middle Hulton; Farnworth; Wibsey; Idle (six); Thackley; Eccleshill (two); Heston; Tyldesley (two); Lancaster; Grange-over-Sands; Barking; Southend-on-Sea (three); Ashton-on-Ribble; Whittlesea; Downham Market; Brigg (six); Dovercourt; New Wandsworth; Middleham; Middlesbrough; Ferry Hill; Eastbourne (six); Burgess Hill; Blechington; Stanton St. John; Oxford (three); Cassington (two); Long Handborough; Bladon; Ebbes; Brades; Newhaven; Bolsover; Woodford; Elm; Leeds; Widnes; Glossop; Buxton (three); North-West Derbyshire; Whitton; Isleworth; Copthorne; Hayward's Heath; Uckfield; Broughty Ferry; Brighton (two); Tyldesley; Islington (five); Hillmarton; Goatacre; Market Rasen; Binbrook; Aylsham; London; East Bristol (two); Eastwood; Tickhill; Bingley; Bristol (thirteen); Garras Mawyan; Warrington; Gulfach; Paignton; Stockport; Newbiggin-by-the-Sea; Deal; Kingswood (two); Lidgate; Wickhambrook; West Hartlepool (two); Hartlepool; Glasgow; Eltham; Wimbledon; Southampton; Calne; Chippenham; Cwm-y-gaist; Huddersfield; Tisbury; Ely; Mostyn; Chedworth; Melksham; Gosberton; Bradford-on-Avon; Cowes; Seaforth; Whiteparish; Wadhurst; Sudbury; Longwood; Ryburgh; Puddington; Witheridge; Griffithstown (two); Ashington; Dulwich (two); Penge; Purley; Horsham (three); Crawley (two); Liskeard; Oldbury; Terrington; Swansea (three); Cawston; Itteringham; Louth; Langworth; Berkhampstead; Oswersby; Wood Green; Keighley (six); Greenhead; Hexham (two); Slaley; Hemel Hempstead; South Manchester; Cross Hills; Wells next the Sea; Tottenham; Thornton; Sutton-in-Craven; Bexhill; Ealing Dean; West Coanwood; Allendale Town; Kentish Town, N.W.; Burgess Hill (two); Manchester; Stockport; Oakham; Knaresborough; Hibaldstow; Westwood; St. Silas; Aston (six); Birmingham (two); Bedminster (three); Sudbury; Cleckheaton; Nottingham; Forest Hill; Widnes; Luddendenfoot; Henham; Saffron Walden; Walsingham; Holbeach (six); Fleet Fen; Whaplode Drove; Barwell; Earl Shilton; Hinckley; Brampton; Wickmere; Hamworth; Alborough; Cowling Hill; Old Cleeve; Broomfield; and Timberscombe; to lie upon the Table 770

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill and Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petition from Sheffield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 773

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table. Petitions in favour, from Glasgow; Elgin; Dyce; and Dundee; to lie upon the Table 773

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Burgess Hill (two); Birkdale; Southport (nine); Earlestown; Waterloo (two); Crosby; Aymestry; Llanelly (twenty-three); Hastings (two); Truro; Tresillian; Merthyr; Penweathers; Lydney; Old Cleeve; Bury (two); Walton-on-Thames; Luckwell Bridge; Timberscombe; Redruth; Delabole; Copthorne; St. Breward; Launceston (three); Maxworthy; Warbstow; Trespanett; Treneglos; Poundstock; Jacobstow; Cold Northcott; Week St. Mary; Boyton; Tresmeer; Stratton; Saint Gennys; Pudsey; Smethwick (three); Handsworth; Patricroft (two); Swinton; Whittle Brook; Flixton; Little Hulton; Birmingham (two); Stockport; Burnley (five); Pendlebury; Mereclough; Odley Moor; Fulledge; Nomansland; Seagrave; Southampton; Sutton Oak; St. Helens; Ponders End; Widnes (six); Oxford; Mossley Hill; Balham Grove; Bicester; Brighton (three); Altarnon; Norfolk (two); Tyersal; Sheffield (two); Maldon; Sevenoaks; Measham; Stebbing; Loughton; Longstone; Hambledon; Gosport; Manchester (six); Lutton; Rhymney; Ebbw Vale (two); New Tredegar; Waunllwyd; Beaufort; Cwm; Aberystwyth; Glyncorwg; Moreton-in-Marsh; Porthcawl; Dowlais (fifteen); Forest of Dean; Timberscombe; Launceston; Darnall; Pudsey (two); Sparkbrook; Small Heath; Cerne Abbas; Bowbridge; Lyme Regis; Middle Hulton; Farnworth; Atherton (two); Barling; Whittlesea (two); Lessingham; Tyldesley; Norwich; Brigg (six); Middleham; Ferry Hill; Southend-on-Sea (two); Middlesbrough (three); North Ormesby (two); Eastbourne (five); Newhaven (two); Brades; South Norwood (two); Croydon; Newburn; Stoneham; Wisbech; Friday Bridge; Sherburn; Seamer (two); Brompton; East Ayton; Snainton; Scarborough (three); Sugdale; Saltburn; Stokesley; Walbottle; Newby; Battersby; Herne Bay; Dover; South Molton; Uckfield; East Northants; Buxton (two); Elm; Glossop; Walthamstow; Garston; St Helens; Aston; Horsham; Micheldever; Cleckheaton; Swansea; Cawston; Itteringham; Thornton; Aylsham; Walsingham; Whaplode Drove; Holbeach; Hinckley; Barwell; Brompton; Alborough; Bideford; Sunderland; Market Rasen; Langworth; Hemel Hempstead; Wood Green; Heallys; Keighley (three); Cross Hills; Glasgow; Hanworth; Belper; Owersby; Abercarne; Tottenham; Wickmere; Sudbury; Garras Mawgan; Binbrook; Abbotsham; Greenhead; Paignton; Allendale; Hexham-on-Tyne; Gorleston; Warrington; Witheridge; Great Ryburgh; Paddington; Gelligaer; Sabden; Openshaw; West Hartlepool (two); Hartlepool; Eltham; Seaforth; Purley; East Dulwich; Motherwell; St. Cleer; Polruan; Newbiggin by the Sea; Holbeach (three); West Coanwood; St. Silas; Aston (two); Aston Park; and Lymington; to lie upon the Table 773

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Southport; Newton Nottage; Gelligaer; Newcastle; Emlyn; and Raglan; to lie upon the Table 774

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 21st June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 227] 774

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 21st June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288] 774

une 22.] Page

LECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 TO 1890 (PROCEEDINGS) -Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Applications to and Proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1890, during the past year [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 229.] 775

RUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th June; *Sir John William Maclure*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 230.] 775

AST INDIA RAILWAYS (PURCHASE)—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 18th June; *Mr. Cohen*]; to lie upon the Table 775

EDFORDSHIRE REGIMENT (RECRUITS, ETC.)—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th May; *Mr. Hudson*]; to lie upon the Table 775

EAD POISONING—Address for "Return giving (a) the number of cases of Lead Poisoning reported under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1895, in the manufacture of earthenware and china during the period from the 1st day of January, 1899, to the 31st day of May, 1900, distinguishing between cases in the decorative processes and cases in the processes of dipping, ware cleaning, etc.; (b) the number of persons suspended from working in dangerous processes by the certifying surgeons for the Hanley, Burslem, Tunstall, and Stoke districts in the same manufacture during the same period, in pursuance of the special rules."—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*) 775

QUESTIONS.

OUTH AFRICAN WAR—PROPOSED VISIT OF COLONIAL CONTINGENTS TO THE MOTHER COUNTRY—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Under Secretary for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 775

ELEASED BRITISH PRISONERS—Question, Mr. Palmer (Reading); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 776

ROMOTION FROM THE RANKS—Question, Mr. Runciman (Oldham); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 776

ETURN OF RESERVISTS FROM SOUTH AFRICA—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Hertfordshire, Hertford); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 776

ETTLEMENT OF SOLDIERS IN SOUTH AFRICA AFTER THE WAR—Question, Mr. Boscawen (Kent, Tonbridge); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 777

ESERVISTS' PENSIONS—Question, Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 777

OLUNTEER MOUNTED INFANTRY GRANT—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 778

LDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT FATALITIES—Questions, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) and Major Rasch; Answers, Mr. Wyndham ... 778

TH HUSSARS—OFFICERS ON SPECIAL DUTY—Question, Colonel Welby (Taunton); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 779

ROMOTION OF SECOND LIEUTENANTS OF ARTILLERY AND ENGINEERS—Question, Mr. Newdigate (Warwickshire, Nuneaton); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 779

June 22.] *Page*

MILITIA OFFICERS' PAY—Question, Mr. Boscawen; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 780

MILITIA COMMISSIONS—Question, Mr. Boscawen; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 780

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—PRESENT POSITION AT PEKING, TIENTSIN, ETC.—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 781

BRITISH FORCES ON THE CHINA STATION—Question, Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney Antrim, S.) 782

THE PRESS AND FOREIGN OFFICE PAPERS—Question, Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 783

OUTRAGE ON A BURMESE WOMAN AT RANGOON—THE WEST KENT REGIMENT—Question, Sir Lewis M'Iver (Edinburgh, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 784

INDIAN BUDGET—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 784

REPORT OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF FACTORIES—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasurer (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 785

W.C.D.O. AUXILIARY POSTMEN AND THE TWEEDMOUTH REPORT—Question, Mr. Steadman (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 785

LONDON TELEGRAPH SERVICE—TEA RELIEFS—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 786

CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE—DINNER INTERVALS—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 787

LONDON DOCKS ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Alban Gibbs (London); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) ... 787

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REPORT—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis; Answer, The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education) Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) 788

MOTOR CARS—SPEED REGULATIONS—Question, Mr. Price (Norfolk, E.); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 788

IRISH SCHOOLS—RESULTS, FEES—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 789

IRISH LAND PURCHASE—ANDREW ALLEN'S HOLDING—Question, Mr. Murnaghan (Tyrone, Mid); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 789

CROWN ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS—Question, Mr. Gedge (Walsall); Mr. A. J. Balfour 790

June 22.] *Page*

CELTIC ANTIQUITIES IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM—Questions, Sir Henry Howarth (Salford, S.), Mr. Stanley Leighton (Shropshire, Oswestry), and Mr. Vicary Gibbs (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 791

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE AT PARIS—Question, Mr. Pierpoint (Warrington); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 793

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

SELECTION (STANDING ORDERS)—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following fifteen Members in respect of the Executors (Scotland) Bill; Mr. Asher, Sir Charles Cameron, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Alexander Cross, Colonel Denny, Mr. Dewar, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gordon, Sir Lewis M'Iver, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Renshaw, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Sir Walter Thorburn, and Mr. Wylie. Report to lie upon the Table 794

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to the Uganda Railway Bill. That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Law as to Marriage contracted in the Colonies with a Deceased Wife's Sister." Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill [Lords] 794

Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 264] 794

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 231.] Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 231.] Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 265] 794

Post Office Sites Bill—Sir John Colomb, Mr. Hanbury, and Mr. Johnson-Ferguson nominated Members of the Select Committee on the Post Office Sites Bill, with two Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.—(*Sir William Walrond.*) 794

NEW BILLS.

BURIAL GROUNDS (LOANS) (SCOTLAND)—Bill to extend the period of repayment of Loans for Burial Grounds in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Morley and Captain Sinclair 795

Burial Grounds (Loans) Scotland Bill—"To extend the period of repayment of Loans for Burial Grounds in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read the second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 266]

LARCENY ACT (1861) AMENDMENT. The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs): 795

Bill to amend Section 75 of the Larceny Act, 1861, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, and Mr. Solicitor General.

Larceny Act (1861) Amendment Bill—"To amend Section 75 of the Larceny Act, 1861," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 267] 795

June 22.] Page

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY]—Considered in Committee.

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS II.

1. £51,299, to complete the sum for Treasury and Subordinate Departments.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.) 795
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Bristol, W.) ... 796
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 797
Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 798
Mr. Gibson Bowles 801

Vote agreed to.

2. £7,340 to complete the sum for Privy Council Office.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.) 803
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 804

3. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,028, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Agriculture, and to pay certain Grants in Aid."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 805
Mr. Martin (Worcestershire, Droitwich) 805

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,928, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Price.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire W.) 806
Mr. H. S. Foster (Suffolk, Lowestoft) 810
Mr. Soames (Norfolk, S.) ... 811
The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Long, Liverpool, West Derby) ... 811
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.)... ... 814
Mr. Loyd (Berkshire, Abingdon) 816
Mr. Arthur J. Moore (Londonderry)... 817
Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire N.R., Thirsk 817
Mr. Long 817
Sir Cuthbert Quilter (Suffolk, Sudbury) 818
Mr. Kearby (Devonport) ... 819
Mr. Long 819
Mr. Wharton (Yorkshire, Ripon) 820

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

4. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £23,036, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and expenses of the Charity Commission for England and Wales."

Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*)... 821

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £22,936, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Goddard.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Channing 827
Mr. Grant Lawson... ... 828
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 830
Mr. Carvell-Williams (*Nottinghamshire, Mansfield*) 831
Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 832
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) 832

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 29; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 153.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

5. £9,778, to complete the sum for Lunacy Commission, England.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 834
The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*)... 837
Sir Walter Foster 837
Capt. Jessel (*St. Pancras, S.*) ... 837
Mr. John Burns 838

Vote agreed to.

6. £67, to complete the sum for the Mint, including Coinage.

DISCUSSION :—

Lord Balcarres 838
Sir M. Hicks-Beach 838

Vote agreed to.

7. £8,097, to complete the sum for National Debt Office.

8. £12,838, to complete the sum for Public Record Office.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. William Jones (*Carnarvonshire, Arfon*) ... 839
Mr. Hanbury 839
Mr. Herbert Lewis 839
Mr. Humphreys-Owen 840

Vote agreed to.

9. £15, to complete the sum for Public Works Loan Commission.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Buchanan 840
Mr. Hanbury 840

Vote agreed to.

10. £23,702, to complete the sum for Registrar General's Office, England.

Vote agreed to.

11. £350,060, to complete the sum for Stationery and Printing.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Humphreys-Owen ... 841
Mr. Hanbury 841
Mr. Gibson Bowles... ... 843
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 845
Mr. William Johnston (Belfast, S.) 845
Capt. Phillpotts (Devonshire, Torquay) 845

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £13,439 be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Her Majesty's Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, and of the Office of Land Revenue Records and Inrolments."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Herbert Lewis... ... 846
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire) 849
Capt. Jessel 850
Mr. John Burns 851
Mr. Gibson Bowles 854

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £13,339, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Hanbury 857
Mr. Lloyd-George 860
Mr. Herbert Lewis 862
Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire Mid)... 865

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

POST OFFICE SITES [EXPENSES]—Resolution reported; "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of the moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all sums payable by the Postmaster General under any Act of the present session to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire Lands for the Public Service, and of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect the Provisions of such Act."

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [19TH JUNE]—Resolutions reported :—ARMY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901. 1. "That a sum, not exceeding £10,000,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Transport and Remounts, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £13,100,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

Resolutions agreed to.

June 22.] *Page*

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,680,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Clothing Establishments and Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1901."

Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*)... 866
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 870

Resolution agreed to.

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,000,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Supply and Repair of Warlike and other Stores, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,670,700 be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Staff for Engineer Services, and Expenditure for Royal Engineer Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad (including Purchases), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £113,800, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Establishments for Military Education, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £66,900, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Sundry Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,611,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Retired Pay, Half Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers and others, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,379,000 be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals and the In-Patients thereof, of Out-Pensions, of the Maintenance of Lunatics for whom Pensions are not drawn, and of Gratuities awarded in Commutation and in lieu of Pensions, of Rewards for Meritorious Services, of Victoria Cross Pensions, and of Pensions to the Widows and Children of Warrant Officers. etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 21st day of March, 1901."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £186,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS VI.

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £284,058, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities under sundry Statutes for Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities awarded by the Treasury, and for the Salaries of Medical Referees."

12. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,800, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for certain Pensions to Masters and Seamen of the Merchant Service, and to their Widows ond Children."

13. "That a sum, not exceeding £725, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for certain Miscellaneous, Charitable, and other Allowances."

CLASS VII.

14. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,452, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and other Expenses of Temporary Commissions, Committees, and Special Inquiries."

15. " That a sum not exceeding £1,370, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for certain Miscellaneous Expenses."

16. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for a Grant in Aid of the Expenses of the Royal Commission for the British Section at the Paris International Exhibition, 1900."

Resolutions agreed to 870

Adjourned at half after Twelve of the clock.

LORDS: MONDAY, 25TH JUNE, 1900.

LORD INCHIQUIN.—Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Lucian William, Baron of Inchiquin, to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 873

ROYAL ASSENT.

COMMISSION.—The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—1. Public Health (Ireland); 2. Uganda Railway; 3. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1); 4. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3); 5. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4); 6. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5); 7. Rhymney Iron Company; 8. Church's Patent; 9. Otley Urban District Council Water; 10. Cork, Bandon, and South Coast Railway; 11. Higham Ferrers Water; 12. Cleethorpes Gas; 13. Dundee Harbour; 14. London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway; 15. Governments Stock and other Securities Investment Company; 16. Southport Water; 17. Hastings Harbour; 18. Maidenhead Gas; 19. Glastonbury Corporation Gas; 20. Manchester Ship Canal; 21. Central London Railway; 22. Lancashire Inebriates Acts Board; 23. Dorking Water; 24. Fishguard Water and Gas; 25. Menstone Water (Transfer); 26. Newport Corporation; 27. Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas; 28. Cowes Pier: 29 Great Central Railway ... 873

New Peer.—The Right Hon. Sir Peter O'Brien, Baronet, Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, having been created Baron O'Brien of Kilfenora in the county of Clare—was (in the usual manner) introduced 874

Sat First.—The Earl of Londesborough sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 874

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways; Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways; British Gas Light Company (Staffordshire Potteries); Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water; Lancaster Corporation; St. David's Railway Abandonment; West Bromwich Corporation. And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5). The same were ordered to lie on the Table 874

Great Berkhampstead Water Bill [H.L.]; Motherwell Water Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 874

Airdrie, Coatbridge, and District Water Trust Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 30th of April and 28th of May last discharged; and Bill committed for To-morrow... 875

Wolverhampton Gas Bill; Caledonian Railway Bill [H.L.]; Woodbridge District Water Bill; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill; London and San Francisco Bank Bill [H.L.]; Hammond (G. H.) Company Bill [H.L.]; Crystal Palace Company Bill [H.L.]—Reported, with Amendments ... 875

Latimer Road and Acton Railway Bill—Reported with an Amendment 875

Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 875

Airdrie and Coatbridge Tramways Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 875

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow 875

London and North Western Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 875

St. Albans Water Bill—Read 2^a, and committed 875

London and North Western Railway (Wales) Bill; Devonport Corporation Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 875

Morecambe Urban District Council (Gas) Bill—Read 3^a, and passed ... 875

June 25.] *Page*

South Eastern and London Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; Withington Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 876

Belfast and County Down Railway Bill; Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 876

Birmingham (King Edward The Sixth) Schools Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 876

Lee Conservancy Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Rosse be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Ribblesdale, and that the Earl of Rosse be Chairman of the said Committee; read and agreed to ... 876

Reading Corporation (Tramways) Bill; Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill; London County Council (Spitalfields Market) Bill; Wolverhampton, Essington, and Cannock Chase Junction Railway Bill; North Metropolitan Railway and Canal Bill; Midland Railway Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Dartrey be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Carysfort (*E. Carysfort*): read, and agreed to 876

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 876

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow ... 877

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 877

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow 877

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow 877

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Petersham) Provisional Order Bill—Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed 877

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill (No. 123); Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill (No. 124)—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; referred to the Examiners; and to be read 2^a To-morrow.—(*The Lord Balfour*) 877

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill (No. 125); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill (No. 127)—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; referred to the Examiners; and to be read 2^a To-morrow.—(*The Lord Harris*) 877

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CERTIFIED INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES (REGULATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT).—Regulations made with the approval of the Home Secretary for the management and discipline of the Farmfield Certified Inebriate Reformatory, Charlwood, near Horley: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 878

NEW BILL.

Colonial Stock Bill [H.L.]—A Bill to amend the Colonial Stock Acts, 1877 to 1892, and the Trustee Act, 1893—was presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1ª; and to be printed, (No. 122) 878

Militia Ballot Bill [H.L.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Wemyss 878

Second Reading, by leave of the House, put off to Monday next.

Poor Removal Bill [SECOND READING]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Harris 879

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

Union of Benefices Act, 1860, Amendment Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

The Earl of Kimberley ... 882 *The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* 882

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment, and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

Military Manœuvres Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1:—

Lord Montagu of Beaulieu... 883 *The Secretary of State for War (The Marquess of Lansdowne)* 883

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:—

Lord Montagu of Beaulieu... 883 *The Marquess of Lansdowne* ... 884

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

June 25.] *Page*

County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order).

Earl Spencer 885

Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Five of the clock.

COMMONS: MONDAY, 25TH JUNE, 1900.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners. The House went, and being returned, Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills 885

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [Lords] (by Order)—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time 885

Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny) 886

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz., Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords]; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [Lords]; Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [Lords]; Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [Lords]; Preston Corporation Bill [Lords]; Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 888

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO NOT COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have not been complied with, viz., Salford Corporation Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 888

June 25.] *Page*

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill, London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow ... 889

Ossett Corporation Gas Bill; Southport Extension and Tramways Bill; Stockport Corporation Tramways Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 889

Paignton Urban District Water Bill [Lords]—Prince of Wales's consent, as Duke of Cornwall, signified. Verbal Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 889

Belfast and County Down Railway Bill—As amended, considered Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell*).

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed. [New Title] ... 889

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed... 889

Barnsley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Bill [Lords]; Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed 889

Mersey Railway Bill [Lords]; Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill [Lords]; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]; Rotherham Corporation Bill [Lords]; South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Westgate and Birchington Water Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed 890

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill—Read the third time, and passed 890

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed 890

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 890

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed 890

London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill; London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill—As amended, considered; to be read the third time Tomorrow 890

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed 890

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill—Reported, without amendment [Provisional Orders confimed]; Report to lie upon the Table—Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 890

June 25.] *Page*

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill—Reported, without amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 891

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill—Reported, without amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 891

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Reported, with amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 891

Sheffield District Railway Bill [Lords]; Plymouth, Stonehouse, and Devonport Tramways Bill—Reported, with amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 891

Birmingham Corporation (Stock) Bill [Lords]—Reported, without amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. Bill to be read the third time 891

Edinburgh District Lunacy Board Bill [Lords]; Lincoln Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]—Reported, with amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 891

Neath Harbour Bill [Lords]—Reported, without amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time... 891

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to Amendments to Cowes Pier Bill [Lords], Great Central Railway Bill [Lords], without amendment. That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to enable the South Eastern Railway Company to make new Railways and other works; to acquire additional lands; to provide for the application of capital of the South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Companies; and for other purposes." South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords]. And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to empower the Urban District Council for the district of Withington to construct Tramways and to make various street improvements; and for other purposes." Withington Urban District Council Bill [Lords] ... 891

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords]—Withington Urban District Council Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills ... 892

Falkirk and District Water Bill [Lords]—Reported, with amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 892

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill — Petitions against, from Gourock; and Dumbarton; to lie upon the Table 892

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS)—Petition from Buckland Brewer, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 892

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Edinburgh; and Kirriemuir; to lie upon the Table 892

June 25.] *Page*

Lunacy Bill—Petitions for alteration, from Kingston-on-Thames; and Ticehurst; to lie upon the Table 892

Roman Catholic University in Ireland—Petition from Rothesay, against Establishment; to lie upon the Table 892

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour; from Hammersmith; Willington Quay; Benwell-on-Tyne; Wallsend; Walbottle; Throckley; Wells; Bardon Mill; Five Oak Green; Prudhoe-on-Tyne; Over; and Haltwhistle; to lie upon the Table 893

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions against, from North Shields; South Shields; Windsor; and Exmouth; to lie upon the Table. Petitions in favour, from Chester; Damerham; Fordingbridge; Wotton-under-Edge (two); Bishopston; Wigton; Glossop (three); Newfield; Shrewsbury (three); Cottenham; Chatham; North Skelton; Brotton; Saltburn; Wisbech; Ashcott; Wisbech St. Peters; Nunney; Wanstrow; Glastonbury; Kendal (five); Newcastle; Windermere; Leeds; Aylesford; Greasborough; Glasgow; Horsley Heath; Liverpool (two); Wigan (three); Sutton Coldfield; Olton; Leek; Cam; Wandsworth (three); Balham; Beccles; Bungay; Wallasey; West Derby; Wallsend; Barnard Castle; Penygelli; Thurning; Walker; Birmingham (two); Harborne (two); Walbottle; Dore (two); West Bridgford; Longtown; Gateshead-on-Tyne; Willington Quay; Ladywood; Guildford; Copley Lane; North Shields; Tynemouth; South Shields (two); Northwich; Leigh; Dalwood; Micklethwaite; Luxborough; Pedwell; Newcastle-Emlyn; Bingley; Bolton; Stockwell; Kennington; Milton, Faversham; Sittingbourne; Ince; Tonbridge; Harp Castle; Durley; Ebbw Vale (two); Oldham; Lowgate; Brynteg; Warden; Luton; Rishton; Morton; Prudhoe; Hexham; Haydon Bridge; Newborough; Bardon Mill (two); Tunstall; Corbridge-on-Tyne; Hadlow; Middle Madeley; Bellingham; Wigan; Tunbridge Wells; Haltwhistle (two); Basingstoke; Shrewley; Victoria; Llangattock; Hadfield; Cambridge (three); Talgarth; Plumstead; Purton; Woolwich; Northwich; Bradford; Ardwick; Old Chesterton; Long Eaton; Axminster (two); Bingley (three); Chatteris; Woodhouse; Folkestone (two); Wharfedale; Gilsted; Otterburn; Nantyglo; Aberystwith; Bideford; Seaton; Middlewich; Exmouth (two); Lympstone; Colyton; Honiton; Sidmouth; Bently; and Hull; to lie upon the Table 893

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petition in favour, from Irongray; Glasgow; and Gulston; to lie upon the Table ... 894

Sunday Closing Monmouthshire Bill—Petitions in favour, from Troon; Brierley Hill; Horseley Heath; Dore; Islington; Newfield; Shrewsbury (two); Cottenham; Sunderland; Cam; Brotton; Wisbech; Wanstrow; Nunney; Glossop (six); Hayle; Windermere; Kentish Town; Tuckingmill; Camborne; Cambria; Wigan (three); Blackburn; Bramley; Sheldon; Tamworth; Sutton Coldfield; Olton; Etley; Wotton-under-Edge (two); Liverpool (three); Weston-super-Mare; Bungay; Beccles; Wallasey; North Shields; Copley Lane; Barnard Castle; Newcastle; South Shields; Godalming; Fenton; Willington Quay; Leigh; Walker; Harborne (two); Throckley; Birmingham (two); Newborough; Prudhoe-on-Tyne; Abertillery; Warden; Rishton; Oldham; Lowgate; Corbridge on-Tyne; Bellingham; Wharfedale; Glasgow; Victoria; Long Compton; Northwich; Cambridge; Talgarth; Llangattock; Beaufort; Bradford; Plumstead; Woolwich; Mansfield; Mansfield Woodham; Manchester;

June 25.] Page

Chatteris; Weston-super-Mare (four); Bardon Mill (two); Blaina; Appledore; Bideford; East Kirkby; Middlewich; Leytonstone; Beer; Colyton; Sidmouth; York; Kingsteignton; Over; Haltwhistle; Purton; Axminster; Budleigh Salterton; Seaton; Luxborough; Newcastle Emlyn; Isle of Sheppey; Sittingbourne; Ince; and Hays Castle; to lie upon the Table 894

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Llangattock; Glyncorwg; and Talgarth; to lie upon the Table 894

Temperance Reform Threefold Option (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Elder Park, in favour; to lie upon the Table 894

Vagrants' Children Protection Bill—Petition from Oldham, in favour; to lie upon the Table 894

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA RAILWAYS (PURCHASE)—Return [presented 22nd June] to be printed. [No. 252] 895

INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES (RULES FOR MANAGEMENT)—Copy presented, of Regulations for the Management of the Farmfield Certified Inebriate Reformatory, Charlwood, near Horley [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 895

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL)—Copy presented, of Report No. 290 (British Guiana, Annual Reports for 1897–8 and 1898–9) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. Copy presented, of Report No. 291 (Falkland Islands, Annual Report for 1899) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 895

CYPRUS—Copy presented, of Annual Reports for 1898–9 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 895

COLONIAL REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS)—Copy presented, of Report No. 13 (Cook Islands, Report for 1899) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 895

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS—Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of St. Andrews for the year 1898–9 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 233] ... 895

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES)—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2461 and 2462 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 895

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES)—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 528 and 529 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 895

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (CONTRACTS)—Return ordered, "of all Contracts made in the United Kingdom for manufactured articles by the several Government Departments between the 1st day of April, 1899, and the 31st day of March, 1900, either with contractors outside the United Kingdom or with contractors or agents who obtain the articles from Abroad (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 364, of Session 1899)."—(*Sir Howard Vincent*) 895

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Copy ordered, "of Special Report by the Board of Trade on the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie*) 896

June 25.] *Page*

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE—Return ordered, "of Net Public Income and Net Public Expenditure under certain specified Heads, as represented by Receipts into and Issues out of the Exchequer from 1869–70 to 1899–1900, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 309, of Session 1899)."—(*Sir Henry Fowler*) 896

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND)—Return ordered, "giving the number of Arrests for Drunkenness within the Metropolitan Police District of Dublin and the cities of Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, on Sundays between the 1st day of May, 1899, and the 30th day of April, 1900, both days inclusive; the Arrests being given from 8 a.m. on Sundays till 8 a.m. on Mondays; and similar Returns for the rest of Ireland from the 1st day of May, 1899 to the 30th day of April, 1900 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 131, of Session 1900)."—(*Mr. William Johnston*) 896

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—BOER PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA—Questions, Mr. J. A. Pease (Northumberland, Tyneside), and General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 896

POSTAL ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN CAPE TOWN AND ST. HELENA—Question, Mr. Bill (Staffordshire, Leek); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 897

COST OF HORSE TRANSPORT TO THE CAPE—Question, Mr. Runciman (Oldham); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, S.) ... 898

MARTIAL LAW—THE ALLEGED FENIAN PRISONERS AT MAFEKING—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 898

LENDLEY DISASTERS (1ST JUNE)—THE 13TH YEOMANRY BATTALION—Question, Mr. Butcher (York); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 899

DUKE OF EDINBURGH'S VOLUNTEER RIFLES—MR. LOGAN'S GIFT OF A MAXIM GUN—Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson (Cumberland, Cockermouth) and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 899

YEOMARY ADJUTANTS' PAY—Question, Mr. Wingfield-Digby (Dorsetshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 900

HALF-PAY OFFICERS' OUTFIT ALLOWANCE—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 900

RESERVE OF OFFICERS—VOLUNTEER OFFICERS—Question, Col. Pryce-Jones (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 901

ACTING CHAPLAINS TO THE VOLUNTEER FORCE—Question, Sir Barrington Simeon (Southampton); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 901

DOCKYARD EMPLOYEES AND VOLUNTEER TRAININGS—2ND VOLUNTEER BATTALION DEVONSHIRE REGIMENT—Question, Capt. Norton; Answer, Mr. Macartney 901

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY SIDING AT ALDERSHOT — Question, Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 902

June 25.] Page

IRISH ARMY AND MILITIA RECRUITS—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 902

UNDER AGE ENLISTMENTS—ROYAL IRISH FUSILIERS—CASE OF DANIEL DUNDASS—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 903

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN DISTURBANCES—COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT — Question, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 903

THE CAPTURE OF THE TA-KU FORTS—Question, Mr. Hedderwick (Wick Burghs); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 904

RECENT FIGHTING AT TIENTSIN—POSITION AT PEKING—ADMIRAL SEYMOUR'S OPERATIONS—Questions, Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth) and Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Mr. Brodrick and The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 904

EMPEROR OF CHINA — POSITION AND POLITICAL VIEWS — Question, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 905

RUSSIAN FORCES IN NORTH-WESTERN CHINA—Question, Sir Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 905

BRITISH TRADE WITH CHINA—Question, Mr. Drage (Derby); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 906

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—RAILWAYS IN ASIA MINOR—Question, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 906

INDIAN RAILWAY STOCK — Question, Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing)... 907

INDIA—OPIUM AND FOOD CULTIVATION—Question, Mr. Colville (Lanarkshire, N E.); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 908

JAMAICA RUM — EXCISE RESTRICTIONS—Question, Mr. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 908

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH BILL—INTERVENTION OF COLONIAL GOVERNORS —Questions, Mr. Maclean (Cardiff) and Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 908

BOUNTIES IN THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES—Question, Captain Sinclair (Forfarshire); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 909

GOLD COAST COLONY—CONCESSIONS ORDINANCE—Question, Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon, etc.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 909

GAS LIGHT AND COKE COMPANIES CHARGES—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 909

FOREIGN GOODS AND BRITISH MARKS—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield Central); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 911

LEEK POST OFFICE—Question, Mr. Bill; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 911

THE POST OFFICE AND THE NATIONAL TELEPHONE COMPANY—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 911

June 25.] *Page*

CASUAL EMPLOYMENT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN—Question, Mr. Drage; Answer, The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) 912

STORNOWAY SECONDARY EDUCATION SCHOOL—Question, Mr. Hedderwick; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murry, Buteshire)... ... 912

ILLEGAL FISHING IN LOCH FYNE—Question, Sir Charles Cameron (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 913

NAVAL RECRUITING IN THE HIGHLANDS—TRAINING SHIPS—Question, Mr. Hedderwick; Answer, Mr. Macartney 913

GREAT NORTHERN OF IRELAND RAILWAY—CLONES LEVEL CROSSING—Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 913

COOLEHILL (MONAGHAN) POST-MASTERSHIP—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 914

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS IN IRELAND—Question, Mr. William Johnston (Belfast, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White Ridley, Lancs., Blackpool) 915

IRISH TEACHERS' EXAMINATIONS—Question, Sir Thomas Lea (Londonderry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds Central) 915

PRETORIA RELIEF CELEBRATIONS AT DOWNPATRICK—Question, Mr. William Johnston; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 915

NEW QUAY (CLARE) WATER SUPPLY—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 916

ARDGLASS (CO. DOWN) HERRING FISHERY—Questions, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. William Redmond, and Mr. Flavin; Answers, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett, Dublin Co., S.) 917

KERRY MACKEREL FISHERIES—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Plunkett 918

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS AND THE IRISH LABOURERS ACTS—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 918

PRIVATE BILL COMMITTEES—SELECTION OF MEMBERS—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydfil); Answer, Mr. Halsey (Hertfordshire, Watford) 919

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—EXTENSION TO SOLDIERS AND SAILORS—Question, Col. Pryce-Jones; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 919

PRIVATE MEMBERS BILLS—SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL—MIDWIVES BILL—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), and Mr. Egerton (Cheshire, Knutsford); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 920

INDIAN BUDGET—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 922

THE GOVERNMENT AND IRISH NATIONALIST MEMBERS—APPOINTMENT OF MR. GILL IN IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—Question, Mr. Butcher (York); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 923

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL) — MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR reported from the Chairmen's Panel: That they had appointed Sir James Fergusson to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure in respect of the Executors (Scotland) Bill, the County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill, and the Veterinary Surgeons Amendment Bill, and that they had appointed Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Court of Justice, and Legal Procedure in respect of the Elementary Education Bill; report to lie upon the Table ... 923

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed 923

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill—Considered in Committee.

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, after the word 'Council,' to insert the words 'and including a London Borough Council.'"—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION:—

The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Chaplin, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 924
Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 924

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'district,' to insert the words 'acquire and hold land and.'"—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Chaplin 926
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 926
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 928
The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 928
Mr. Maddison (Sheffield, Brightside) 928
Mr. Whitmore (Chelsea) ... 929
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) ... 930
Mr. Chaplin 930
Mr. Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 930
Sir Blundell Maple (Camberwell, Dulwich) ... 931
Mr. Lough (Islington) ... 931
Mr. Steadman (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) ... 932
Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) ... 934
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 934
Mr. Goulding (Wiltshire, Devizes) 935
Mr. Thornton (Clapham) ... 935
Sir Robert Reid 936
Mr. Chaplin 936
Mr. Robson (South Shields) ... 937
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 937
Mr. Chaplin 937
Sir Henry Fowler 938
Sir Robert Finlay 938
Mr. Courtney (Cornwall, Bodmin) 939
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) 940
Mr. Stuart (Shoreditch, Hoxton) . 941
Mr. Channing 941
Sir Robert Finlay 942
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) . 942
Capt. Pretyman (Suffolk, Woodbridge) 943
Mr. Pickersgill 944
Mr. Cripps (Gloucestershire, Stroud) 944

Question put.

The Committee divided : Ayes 132 ; Noes 204. (Division List No. 154.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out 'with consent of the County Council,' in order to insert, 'Shall on an order being made by the Local Government Board.'"—(*Sir Walter Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

DISCUSSION :—

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) ... 950
Mr. Chaplin 950
Mr. Channing 952
Sir F. S. Powell (*Wigan*) ... 952
Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 953
Mr. Chaplin 955
Sir Walter Foster 955

Amendment negatived.

Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice... 957
Mr. Chaplin 958
Sir Henry Fowler 958
Mr. Channing 958
Commdr. Bethell (*Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness*) ... 958
Sir Walter Foster 958
Mr. Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 959
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) 960
Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice ... 960

Verbal Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Channing 961

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 14, to leave out Sub-section 2."—(*Sir Walter Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section 2 stand part of the clause."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin 962
Mr. Lawson Walton ... 963
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*)... 963
Mr. Stuart 964
Sir Robert Finlay 964

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 165 ; Noes, 105. (Division List No. 155.)

Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice... 967
Mr. Chaplin 967
Sir Henry Fowler 967
Mr. Chaplin 969
Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice ... 969
Mr. Hobhouse 970
Mr. Lough 971

Verbal Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after '1890,' to insert the words 'in Section 53 the word "half."'"—(*Sir Walter Foster*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin 972
Mr. Channing 973
Mr. Humphreys-Owen ... 973
Sir Walter Foster 973
Mr. Chaplin 974
Mr. Broadhurst 974

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 80 ; Noes, 130. (Division List No. 156.)

Amendment proposed—

"In line 26 to leave out the word 'special.'"—(*Mr. Grant Lawson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'special' stand part of the clause."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin 977

Mr. Grant Lawson (*Yorkshire N.R., Thirsk*) 977

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, to leave out the words 'or Ireland,'"—(*Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin 978

Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (*Cork*) ... 978

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 120 ; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 157.)

Clause 3 agreed to.

New clause—

"1. Any expenses incurred by the Council of a metropolitan borough under Part 3 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, whether within or without the borough, shall be defrayed as part of the ordinary expenses of the Council, and in that Act the expressions 'district,' 'local authority,' and 'local rate' shall for the purposes of Part 3 of the Act include a metropolitan borough, the Council of the borough, and the general rate of the borough.

"2. Where the Council of a metropolitan borough adopt Part 3 of the said Act the power of the Council to borrow for the purposes of that part shall be exerciseable in the like manner and subject to the like conditions as the power of the Council to borrow for the purposes of Part 2 of that Act."—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

—brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

New clause—

"Section 66 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, shall be qualified by the following proviso added at the end of the section, namely :—Provided that loans raised by local authorities for the purposes of this part of this Act shall be exempt from the provisions as to period of repayment contained in Sub-section 4 of Section 234 of the Public Health Act, 1875, and instead thereof the period of repayment of such loans shall be—(1) not exceeding 100 years for that part of the loan required for the purchase of land ; and (2) not exceeding seventy years for that part of the land required for the erection of buildings."—(*Mr. Hazell.*)

—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin	982	*Sir F. S. Powell*	987
Mr. Steadman	983	*Sir Walter Foster*	988
Mr. Stuart	984	*Mr. Chaplin*	988
Mr. Lowles (*Shoreditch, Haggerston*)	986	*Mr. Moulton* (*Cornwall, Launceston*)	989

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 69; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 158.)

New clause—

> "A local authority shall have power to hire land for the purposes of Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, as amended by this Act, and sub-sections two, three, four, and five of section ten of the Local Government Act, 1894, shall apply for the determination of questions arising in connection with such hiring."—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

—brought up and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin	994	*Mr. Channing*	994

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 81; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 159.)

New clause—

> "Where land acquired by a council under Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, is appropriated for the purpose of rehousing persons displaced by the council under the powers of any other Part of that Act or of any other enactment, the receipts and expenditure in respect of that land (including all costs in respect of the acquisition and laying out of the land), and of any buildings erected thereon, may be treated as receipts and expenditure under that Part or enactment, but shall be accounted for under a separate head."—(*Mr. Stuart.*)

—brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Chaplin 1001

Question put, and agreed to; clause added.

New clause—

> "Any council shall, in respect of land, buildings, and other property acquired under Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, as amended by this Act, have the same powers of borrowing money on mortgage as are, by Sections 235 to 239, inclusive, of The Public Health Act, 1875, conferred upon any local authority in respect of land, works, or other property acquired for the purposes of disposal of sewage."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

—brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr Chaplin	1003	*Sir Albert Rollit* (*Islington, S.*)	1003
Mr Lough	1003		

Question put, and negatived.

New clause—

> "(1) The local authority, if not a rural district council, with the consent of the Local Government Board, and if a rural district council with the consent of the county council, may lease any land acquired by them under and for the purposes of Part 3 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') to any lessee for the purpose and under the condition that the lessee will carry the Act into execution by building and maintaining on the land lodging-houses within the meaning of the Act; and the local authority may insert in any lease all such provisions as they may think fit for insuring the user of the land and buildings for lodging houses within the meaning of the Act, and in particular the local authority may insert in any lease provisions binding the lessee to build on the land as in the lease prescribed, and to maintain and repair the buildings, and securing the use of the buildings exclusively as lodging-houses within the meaning of the Act, and prohibiting any addition to or alteration of the character of the buildings without the consent of the local authority; and also a provision for the re-entry of the local authority on the land on the breach of any of the terms of the lease; and every deed or instrument of demise of the land or buildings shall be endorsed with notice of this sub-section. (2) Sections 61 and 62 of the Act shall not extend to any lodging-house to which this Act applies."—(*Mr. Whitmore.*)

—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin	 1005	*Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice*	... 1006
Mr. Stuart...	 1006	*Sir F. S. Powell*	 1007
Mr. Cohen ...	 1006	*Mr. Lough*	 1008

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 165; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 160.)

Drafting Amendments made.

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 11 to omit the word 'may' in order to insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Moulton	 1011	*Mr. Hobhouse*	 1011

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 13, after the word 'repair,' to insert the words 'and insure.'"—(*Sir Francis Powell*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Gedge (*Walsall*)	... 1011	*Mr. Chaplin*	 1011

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed: In line 19 after the word "sub-section" to add "provided that in the case of a council in London the consent of a Secretary of State shall be substituted for the consent of the Local Government Board."—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added.

New clause—

> "For the purposes of Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, a local authority may acquire land compulsorily at a price based on the annual value assessed for taxation, and they may schedule any site for acquisition within five years from the date of the notice of their intention to the owner, and may take possession six months after notice has been served upon the said owner. The price to be paid for such land shall not exceed the value of the land when it is scheduled, plus any additional value accruing at the rate of the average annual increase of value of the site for five years previous to the date of such scheduling."—(*Mr. Steadman.*)

—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin 1013
Mr. H. C. Richards (*Finsbury, E.*)... 1014
Mr. Steadman 1014
Mr. Maddison 1015

Question put and negatived.

New clause—

> "The price of any land taken by a rural district council for the purposes of this Act otherwise than by agreement shall be determined by a single arbitrator to be named by the Local Government Board, and the arbitrator in determining the price of such land shall not make any addition in respect of compulsory purchase."—(*Mr. Channing.*)

—brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Chaplin 1017
Mr. Channing 1018
Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid*) 1018

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 78 ; Noes, 161. (Division List No. 161.)

Bill reported ; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 268.]

SUPPLY [22ND JUNE]—Resolutions reported :—

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900-1901.

CLASS II.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £51,299, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses in the Department of Her Majesty's Treasury and Subordinate Departments."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £7,340, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council."

June 25.] *Page*

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £11,028, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Agriculture, and to pay certain Grants in Aid."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £23,036, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Charity Commission for England and Wales."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,778, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Commissioners in Lunacy in England."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £67, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Mint, including the Expenses of Coinage."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,097, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Debt Office."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £12,838, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Public Record Office."

9. "That a sum not exceeding £15, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Establishment under the Public Works Loan Commissioners."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £23,702, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of the Registrar-General of Births, etc., in England."

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £350,060 be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Stationery, Printing, Paper, Binding, and Printed Books for the Public Service, and for the Salaries and Expenses of the Stationery Office; and for sundry Miscellaneous Services, including Reports of Parliamentary Debates."

Resolutions agreed to 1021

SUPPLY—[24TH MAY]—Resolution reported :—

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS II.

"That a sum, not exceeding £32,339, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland."

Resolution agreed to 1023

District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Bill—Read the third time, and passed.

G.P.O.—TRANSFER TO MOUNT PLEASANT—POSTAL DELAYS—On the Motion for Adjournment—

Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.) 1023

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 1023

[Adjourned at Twenty-five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

LORDS: TUESDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with : Belfast and County Down Railway ; Great Northern Railway (Ireland). Also the Certificates that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills : Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6); Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8). And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with : Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) ; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) ; Land Registry (New Buildings). The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1025

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the following Bills—Metropolitan District Railway, South Metropolitan Gas—ought to be dispensed with, and the Bills allowed to proceed ; read, and agreed to 1025

Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill—A Petition of Messrs. Grahames, Currey, and Spens, of No. 30, Great George Street, Westminster, Parliamentary agents, praying for leave to present a Petition of the promoters of the Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 93 for presenting such Petition has expired ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table ; and Standing Order No. 93 to be considered on Thursday next in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said Petition 1025

June 26.] *Page*

North Warwickshire Water Bill—Reported, with Amendments 1025

Vale of Rheidol Light Railway Bill—Reported, with an Amendment ... 1026

Airdrie, Coatbridge, and District Water Trust Bill; Hartlepool Gas and Water Bill; Great Eastern Railway Bill; Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill; City of London Electric Lighting Bill—Reported, with Amendments... 1026

Dublin Corporation Bill; Clontarf Urban District Council Bill—Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over To-morrow 1026

Fraser Settled Chattels Bill [H.L.]; Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways Bill; Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill—Read 2^a... 1026

British Gaslight Company (Staffordshire Potteries) Bill—Read 2^a, and committed 1026

Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection... 1026

Lancaster Corporation Bill; St. David's Railway (Abandonment) Bill—Read 2^a, and committed 1026

West Bromwich Corporation Bill; Great Western Railway Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1026

Farnworth Urban District Council Bill; Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas, and South Metropolitan Gas Companies Bill—Read 2^a, and committed 1027

Halifax Corporation Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Tramways Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1027

Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill--Read 2^a, and committed 1027

Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill; Lambeth Water Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1027

London and Saint Katharine Docks, and East and West India Dock Companies Bill—Read 2^a, and committed 1027

Mid-Kent Water Bill; Portland Urban District Gas Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1027

Southport and Lytham Tramroad Bill—Read 2^a, and committed ... 1027

Wandsworth and Putney Gas Bill; South Metropolitan Gas Bill; Metropolitan District Railway Bill—Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1027

Belfast and County Down Railway Bill; Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill—Read 2^a 1027

South Shields Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1027

June 26.] *Page*

Rochdale Corporation Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 1028

Ossett Corporation Gas Bill; Southport Extension and Tramways Bill; Stockport Corporation Tramways Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1028

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Paignton Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1028

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bills to be read 3ª on Friday next 1028

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1028

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next 1028

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 1028

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1028

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill—Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1028

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill.—Read 2ª according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next 1029

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill—Read 2ª (according to Order) 1029

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—Read 2ª (according to Order) 1029

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next 1029

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS—I. Annual Series:—2461. Portugal (Goa); No. 2462. Turkey (Smyrna and district). II. Miscellaneous Series:—No. 528. German Colonies, for the year ending 30th June, 1899; No. 529. Waterway between the Baltic and Black Sea 1029

COLONIES—I. Annual:—No. 290. British Guiana (Reports for 1897-98 and 1898-99); No. 291. Falkland Islands (Report for 1899); No. 292. British New Guinea (Report for 1898-99); No. 293. Bermuda Report for 1899). II. Miscellaneous:—No. 13. Cook Islands (Report for 1899) 1029

June 26.] Page

CYPRUS—Annual Report for 1898-99. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1029

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT—Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of St. Andrews to the Secretary for Scotland under the provisions of the Act 1030

PUBLIC RECORDS (COURT OF EXCHEQUER)—Schedule of classes of documents connected with actions arising out of seizures of goods, etc., or for the recovery of penalties under Acts relating to the customs or excise, and other process in matters relating to the revenue, which formerly were or ought to have been in the office of the King's or Queen's Remembrancer, or of the Exchequer, and which are now in, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in, the Public Record Office 1030

COUNTY TREASURERS (IRELAND) (FEE FUND)—Account for the year ended 25th March, 1900. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1030

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES)—Message from the Commons for leave for the Marquess of Bristol to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House... 1030

JOURNAL COMMITTEE—Report from, that the General Index to ten volumes of the Journals, viz., from the one hundred and sixteenth to the one hundred and twenty-fifth, both inclusive (47th and 48th Vict.—56th and 57th Vict.), is ready for delivery; the same to be delivered in the usual manner ... 1030

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill — Brought from the Commons. Read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Friday next.—(*The Earl of Selborne.*) (No. 128) 1030

District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Bill—Brought from the Commons. Read 1^{a}; and to be printed. (No. 129) 1030

Mines (Prohibition of Child Labour Underground) Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Friday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 130) 1030

County Councils (Elections) Act (1891) Amendment Bill — Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3^{a} on Thursday next... 1031

Lunacy Regulation (Ireland) Bill [H.L.] — Reported from the Standing Committee with a further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 131) 1031

Volunteer Bill [H.L.] — Reported from the Standing Committee with an Amendment; and re-committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 132) 1031

Military Lands Bill [H.L.] —Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 133) 1031

Page

Ancient Monuments Protection Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 134) 1031

Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.]; Military Manœuvres Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next... 1031

Secondary Education Bill—Moved, "That the Bill be read a first time."—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

The Earl of Kimberley 1043

Bill to make better provision for enabling county councils and other local authorities to aid forms of education not being elementary—presented by the Lord President (*D. Devonshire*); read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 135.)

Burial Grounds Bill [SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Belper.*)

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1048
The Lord Archbishop of York ... 1049
The Lord Bishop of Winchester... 1049

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

Marriage Act Amendment Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) ... 1049
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1050

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

Clause 5:—

The Earl of Halsbury ... 1051
The Archbishop of Canterbury ... 1051

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6:—

The Earl of Halsbury ... 1051
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1052
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans 1053
The Earl of Halsbury 1054
The Lord Bishop of Winchester... 1054
The Earl of Camperdown ... 1055

Moved—

"In Clause 6, page 2, line 26, after 'published' to insert 'provided that at the publication of the banns the name of such church is mentioned.'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

Lord Glenesk 1055
The Earl of Kimberley ... 1056
The Lord Bishop of Chichester ... 1056

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

On Question, "That Clause 6 stand part of the Bill," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 29; Not Contents, 18.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7:—

The Earl of Halsbury 1057

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 18 agreed to.

The Earl of Halsbury 1057

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 136.)

County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill; Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill—Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed 1057

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—RETURN OF EXPENSES—Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing the total expenses of the Irish Land Commission for each of the five years ended 31st March, 1896 to 1900."—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

The Earl of Denbigh ... 1058 *The Earl of Mayo* 1059

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

LUNACY ADMINISTRATION—THE "ST. PANCRAS SCANDAL"—

Lord Russell of Killowen ... 1059
The Earl of Halsbury ... 1064
The Earl of Kimberley 1065
The Earl of Halsbury 1066

SECRETARIES TO IRISH COUNTY COUNCILS—

The Earl of Arran ... 1067 *The Earl of Denbigh* 1069

House adjourned at half past Seven of the clock.

COMMONS: TUESDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1900.

Dublin Electric Lighting Bill (by Order)—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and add the words 'three months.'"—(*Mr. Carew.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick) 1071
Mr. Brown (Shropshire, Wellington) 1077
Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire W.R., Elland) 1078
Mr. Rutherford (Lancashire, Darwen)... 1081
Mr. J. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 1081
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) ... 1087
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 1091

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 180; Noes, 167. (Division List No. 162.)

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill considered.

Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time.

Oldham Corporation Bill (By Order)—As amended, considered. A clause (Limitation of powers outside borough)—(*Mr. Grant Lawson*)—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time," put.

Discussion:—

Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 1103
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) ... 1105
Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) 1106
Mr. Grant Lawson (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1106
Mr. Strachey (Somerset, S.) ... 1106
The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 1107

Question put, and negatived.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Private Bills [Lords] (Standing Orders not previously inquired into Complied with)—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords]; Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [Lords]. Ordered, that the Bills be read a second time ... 1107

Private Bills [Lords] (Standing Orders not previously inquired into not complied with.)—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have not been complied with, viz.:—North British Railway Bill [Lords].—Ordered, that the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 1108

Brewery and Commercial Investment Trust Bill [Lords]; Bristol Water Bill [Lords]; Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill [Lords]; Milford Docks Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, without amendment 1108

Bray Urban District Council Bill—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1108

Rochdale Corporation Bill—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 1108

June 26.] *Page*

Taff Vale Railway Bill [Lords]—Not amended, considered; to be read the third time 1108

Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill [Lords] (By Order)—Read a second time, and committed 1108

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT)—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.—Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lafone and Mr. Wanklyn 1108

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 1109

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Read the third time, and passed 1109

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 1109

London County Tramways (No. 1) Bill—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1109

Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill—Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section A), with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1109

Gun Barrel Proof Act, 1868, Amendment Bill [Lords]—Reported [Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table 1109

East Stirlingshire Water Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1109

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J)—Ordered, That Thomas Bryce Laing do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock 1109

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K)—Ordered, That Frederick J. Dick, Thomas Crossthwaite, and Allen Hornsby do attend the Committee on Group K of Private Bills on Tuesday, 3rd July, at half-past Eleven of the clock, and produce the said documents 1110

STANDING ORDERS—Resolutions reported from the Committee:—1. "That in the case of the Muirkirk, Mauchline, and Dalmellington Railways (Abandonment) Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill.

3. "That, in the case of Roe's Patent Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

4. "That, in the case of the North-Eastern Railway Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolutions agreed to 1110

June 26.] *Page*

North-Eastern Railway Bill [Lords].—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 1110

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—Metropolitan Common Scheme (Petersham) Provisional Order Bill, Morecambe Urban District Council (Gas) Bill.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Great Berkhampstead Water Bill [Lords], Motherwell Water Bill [Lords], Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, " An Act to confer powers upon the Corporation of the Borough of South Shields for the construction of street works and improvements; and for other purposes." South Shields Corporation Bill [Lords] 1111

South Shields Corporation Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1111

PETITIONS.

British Museum Bill—Petition of the Library Association, for reference to a Select Committee; to lie upon the Table 1111

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Brechin, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1111

Midwives Bill—Petition from Manchester, against; to lie upon the Table ... 1111

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill—Petition from Birmingham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1111

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Enstone; Somercotes; Belper; Handforth; Aldershot; Billinghay; Beeston; Sandbach; Northwich; Frodsham; and Hastings—to lie upon the Table 1111

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petition from Heywood, against; to lie upon the Table. Petitions in favour, from Leeds (three); Carlisle; Hampstead; Banbury; York; Gospel Oak; Oldbury; Worcester; Bath (eight); West Ham; Stroud Green; Sheffield; South Cave; Gainsborough (two); Masborough; Kimberworth (two); Rotherham (three); Bishop Norton; Malling; Newton Heath; Newcastle-upon-Tyne (two); Coventry; Heywood; Ashton-under-Lyne (two); Colne; Elstone; Ightham; Nottingham (three); Devonport; Winterley; Widnes; Maesteg; Alford; Briton Ferry; Pontycymmer; Whaplode; Cadoxton juxta Neath; Coedfranc; Wakeham; Belper; Glasshouses; South Hornsey (three); East Finchley; Whitehaven; Crosscoombe; Weymouth (two); Egremont; Dorchester; Broadway; Carlisle; Balderton; Northampton; Cwmbran; Salford; Bristol; Clapham; Gunnislake; Ambleston; Walworth (three); Maryport (two); Six Hills; East Birmingham; Little Addington; Carnforth; Eston; Battersea; Geddington; Litherland; Doncaster (four); Tow Law (three); Lanehead; Penzance; Billy Row; Cumberland; Balby; St. Just (three); St. Martin's (Scilly); St. Agnes (Scilly); Mexborough; Westgate; Bray; Hull; Berkshire; Hastings; Thorne (three); Boston; Great Yarmouth; Gerards Cross; Newark Road; Austerfield; Cheshire; Camberwell; Bawtry; Frodsham; Todmorden; Maidenhead (two); Walton-on-the-Naze; Marylebone; Regent's Park; Kiveton Park; Wokingham; Ramsbury; Bracebridge; Ripon; and Lincoln (twenty-nine)—to lie upon the Table ... — 1111

June 26.] *Page*

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill and Sunday Closing Monmouthshire Bill—Petition from Lancashire and Cheshire, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1112

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill; Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill; and Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petition from Llansamlet, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1112

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions in favour; from Dundonald; Portpatrick; Campbeltown; Earlston; Aberdeen; and Douglas Water; to lie upon the Table 1112

Smaller Dwellings (Scotland) Bill—Petition of Association of Burgh Officials of Scotland, against, to lie upon the Table... 1113

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petition from Monmouth, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Parkgate; Chester; Reading (ten); Saffron Walden; York; Watford; Ashton-under-Lyne; Burslem; Southampton; Oldbury; St. Austell; Manchester; Bishop Norton; Keadby (two); Nottingham (two); Kidderminster; Magon; Bargoed; Weston-super-Mare (two); Newport; Coventry (two); Widnes; Birmingham (two); Southend-on-Sea; Carnforth; Buckfastleigh (four); Blaengarw; Coedfranc; Cadoxton juxta Neath; Wakeham; Upper Tooting; Exeter; Ripon; Glasshouses; Stroud Green; Rochdale; Crosscoombe; Tolskithy; Four Lanes; Portreath; Pool; Redruth; South Downs; Weymouth; Summerfield; Dorchester; Weymouth; Broadway; Sandback (two); Doncaster (five); Pontefract; Crook; Aldershot; Radcliffe-on-Trent; Newark; Sunderland; Dovercourt; Leicester; Leytonstone; Yardley; Darlington (ten); Melsonby; Eppleby; Aldborough; Barking; Plymouth; Gunnislake; Ambleston; Sixhills; North Thoresby; Tetney; Lavender Hill; Eston; Redcar; Battersea; Clapham; Bulwell; Lane Head; Tow Law; Rotherham; Mytholmroyd; Frodsham; Todmorden; Heywood; Crosskeys; Fleur-de Lis; Balby; Mansfield; Royston; Wokingham; Bradford (five); Austerfield; St. Just (three); St. Agnes (Scilly); Bristol; Stithians; Burrows; Kidderminster; Bischcliffe; Sowerby Bridge; Lincoln; Woodhouse Grove; Great Yarmouth; Lantwardine; Penzance; St. Martin's (Scilly); and Hastings; to lie upon the Table. 1113

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petitions in favour, from Blaengarw; Pontycymmer (two); Coedfranc; Cadoxton-juxta-Neath; and Ambleston; to lie upon the Table 1113

Trusts Funds Bill—Petition from Birmingham, in favour, to lie upon the Table 1113

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

County Treasurers' Fee Fund (Ireland)—Account presented, for the year ended 25th March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1114

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 234] 1114

Lead Poisoning—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 22nd June; *Mr. Jesse Collings*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 235] ... 1114

June 26.] Page

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL)—Copy presented, of Report, No. 293 (Bermuda, Annual Report for 1899) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report, No. 292 (British New Guinea, Annual Report for 1898-9) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1114

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—Public Records (Court of Exchequer).—Copy of a Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents connected with actions arising out of seizures of goods, etc., or for the recovery of penalties under Acts relating to the Customs or Excise, and other Process in matters relating to the Revenue, which formerly were or ought to have been in the Office of the King's or Queen's Remembrancer of the Exchequer, and which are now in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act] 1114

MADRAS LAND REVENUE—Ordered, That so much of the Return relative to Madras Land Revenue, which was presented 8th August, 1899, as relates to the despatch from the Secretary of State for India, with enclosures reviewing correspondence regarding sales of defaulters' lands in Madras, be printed. [No. 236] 1114

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY OF ENGLAND—Copy ordered, "of Account showing the figures upon which the grant of £2,500 per annum, made in aid of the expenses incurred by the Incorporated Law Society of England in the performance of the duties of discipline imposed upon them by the Act 51 & 52 Vic. c. 65, is based."—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 237] 1115

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—TREATMENT OF CAPE REBELS—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1115

ADMINISTRATION OF MARTIAL LAW—Question, Mr. John Ellis; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1115

INOCULATION AGAINST TYPHOID FEVER—Questions, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, W.), Mr. Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross), Colonel Wyndham Murray (Bath), and Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1117

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN DISTURBANCES—JAPANESE ASSISTANCE IN SUPPRESSION—Question, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1117

RECENT OPERATIONS—TIENTSIN AND PEKING—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford)... 1118

ADMIRAL SEYMOUR'S ACTION—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 1118

COMPOSITION OF ADMIRAL SEYMOUR'S NAVAL FORCE ON LAND—Question, Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Goschen 1119

June 26.] *Page*

COMMAND OF THE ALLIED FORCES—Question, Sir J. Colomb; Answer, Mr. Goschen 1119

BRITISH LAND FORCES FOR TIENTSIN—Question, Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1120

CHINESE TRADE IN BRITISH SHIPS—Question, Mr. Drage (Derby); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1120

BRITISH INTERESTS IN THE YANG-TSZE VALLEY—Questions, Mr. Drage and Mr. Hedderwick (Wick Burghs), and Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire W.R., Barnsley; Answers, Mr. Brodrick 1120

TIENTSIN—NEU-CHWANG RAILWAY—Question, Mr. Joseph Walton; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1121

INDIAN TROOPS FOR CHINA—Question, Mr. Maclean (Cardiff); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) ... 1122

ORIGIN AND WARNINGS OF THE ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—Question, Mr. Maclean; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1122

DUAL (NAVAL AND MILITARY) ORGANISATIONS OF NAVAL STATIONS—Question, Sir J. Colomb; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1123

ARMY—EDUCATION OF OFFICERS' SONS—Question, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1123

RIFLE RANGES—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1124

CADET CORPS AND RIFLE CLUBS—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Tomlinson (Preston), and General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1124

RESERVE SQUADRONS—PAY OF ACTING QUARTERMASTERS AND ADJUTANTS—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1125

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT CASUALTIES—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1125

ARMY VETERINARY DEPARTMENT—OFFICERS' TITLES—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham... 1125

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS AND GOOD CONDUCT BADGES—Question, Mr. Seely (Lincoln); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1126

VOLUNTEER QUARTERMASTER SERGEANT—Question, Mr. Price (Norfolk, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1126

MARINE PENSIONERS—CASE OF ROBERTS—Question, Sir John Baker (Portsmouth; Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1126

THE SHIPBUILDING VOTE—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Mr. Goschen 1127

DEPTFORD VICTUALLING YARD—OVERTIME RECORDS—Question, Capt. Norton; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, S.) ... 1127

TRAINING OF SEAMEN—TRAINING SQUADRON SAILING SHIPS—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Goschen 1128

June 26.] *Page*

WESTERN AUSTRALIA—PORTS OF CALL FOR MAIL STEAMERS—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, Mid); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1129

NEW ZEALAND—PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF BOUNDARIES—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1129

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH BILL—INTERFERENCE OF COLONIAL GOVERNORS—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1129

SUPERINTENDENTS OF AFRICAN PROTECTORATES—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1130

INDIA—HONNIBAL SHOOTING CASE—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 1131

INDIAN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 1132

INDIAN FAMINE—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 1132

MAIDSTONE GAOL—WARDER SEARLE'S PENSION—Question, Mr. Cornwallis (Maidstone); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White Ridley, Lancs., Blackpool) 1132

JUTE FACTORY REGULATIONS—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 1133

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—BAILEY v. PLANT—Question, Mr. McKenna; Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 1133

WOKINGHAM PETTY SESSIONS—CASE OF WILLIAM SPINKS—Question, Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 1134

CHARITY COMMISSION—SALES OF CHARITY PROPERTY—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, The Parliamentary Charity Commissioner (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire N.R., Thirsk) 1134

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD—SCHOOL PLACES—Question, Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich); Answer, The Vice President of the Committee of Council of Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) 1135

BARLINNIE PRISON—PAYMENT OF FINES BY PRISONERS—Question, Sir Charles Cameron (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham-Murray, Buteshire) 1135

GREAT NORTHERN OF IRELAND RAILWAY FARES—Question, Mr. Murnaghan (Tyrone, Mid); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1136

STRANGFORD LOUGH—CARLINGFORD LIGHTHOUSE—Question, Mr. Blackiston-Houston (Down, N.), Answer, Mr. Ritchie and The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1136

KILLARNEY LAND APPEALS—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 1137

June 26.] *Page*

SALES TO IRISH TENANTS—Question, Mr Morris (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1138

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1138

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES)—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—Mr. Howell (added in respect of the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill); and had appointed in substitution: Sir Powlett Milbank.

MR. HALSEY further reported from the Committee, That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following Fifteen Members in Respect of the Veterinary Surgeons Amendment Bill:—Mr. Banbury, Sir Thomas Gibson-Carmichael, Mr. Colston, Earl of Dalkeith, Mr. Vaughan-Davies, Mr. Charles Douglas, Sir Frederick Fitz Wygram, Sir Michael Foster, Sir John Kinloch, Mr. M'Crae, Sir George Pilkington, Mr. Shaw-Stewart, Mr. Tennant, Sir John Tuke, and Colonel Welby. Report to lie upon the Table 1138

SELECTION (JOINT COMMITTEES)—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons on Municipal Trading:—Sir John Leng; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. John Wilson (Govan). Report to lie upon the Table... 1139

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTIONS FROM RATES)—Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to give leave to the Marquess of Bristol to attend to be examined as a Witness before the Select Committee on Hospitals (Exemption from Rates).—(*Mr. T. W. Russell*) 1139

NEW BILL.

URBAN DISTRICT COUNCILS—Bill to amend the Law of Public Health, Local Government, and Rating with respect to Urban District Councils and otherwise, ordered to be brought in by Sir John William Maclure and Mr. Joseph Howard.

Urban District Councils Bill—"To amend the Law of Public Health, Local Government, and Rating with respect to Urban District Councils, and otherwise," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 269] ... 1139

Companies Bill [SECOND READING]—Order for Second Reading read. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) 1145
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 1146
Mr. Hoare (Hampstead) ... 1153
Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.) 1154
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) . 1159
Mr. Martin (Worcestershire, Droitwich) 1162
Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.) 1163
Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) 1165

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Mr. Hedderwick, Wick Burghs). House counted, and forty Members being found present.

Mr. Chas. McArthur ... 1168
Mr. Holland (Yorkshire W.R., Rotherham) ... 1168
Mr. Marks (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) 1170
Mr. Butcher (York) 1176
Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) 1178
Mr. Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) 1179

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Lawson Walton ... 1181
Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie)... ... 1181
Serjeant Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 1182
The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1183

Question put.

House divided :—Ayes, 138 ; Noes, 52. (Division List, No. 163.)

Money-Lending Bill [Lords]—Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [21 June] proposed to Question [21st June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Marks (Tower Hamlets, Stepney)... 1187
Mr. Butcher (York) ... 1188
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) 1190
The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1194
Mr. Beckett (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby) 1198
Mr. Birrell (Fifeshire, W.) ... 1199

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

DISCUSSION—

Mr. Birrell 1200
Mr. Beckett 1200
Mr. Lawson Walton ... 1200
Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick) 1200
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1200
Commander Bethell (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) 1201

June 26.] *Page*

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 150 ; Noes, 47. (Division List, No. 164.)

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill—As amended, considered. A clause (Part of 6 and 7 Vict., c. 91, s. 58, not to apply to proceedings under this Act) —(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)—brought up, and read the first and second time, and added. Another clause (Definition) — (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)—brought up and read the first and second time, and added. It being Midnight, Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended, stood adjourned. Bill, as amended, to be further considered upon Thursday 1203

Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill—[Second Reading]—Order for Second Reading read.

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 1203
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) ... 1203

Bill read a second time, and committed for Thursday next.

Registration of Firms Bill—Ordered, That Sir Albert Rollit be discharged from the Committee on Registration of Firms. Ordered, That Mr. Cohen be added to the Committee.—(*Sir William Walrond*) 1203

Water Supply Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged ; Bill withdrawn 1204

Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Harrington (Dublin, Harbour) 1204
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 1204
The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 1204

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

COMMONS :—WEDNESDAY, 26th JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Glasgow and South-Western Railway Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 1205

West Ham Corporation Bill—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 1205

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Bill—"For the Abandonment of the London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway ; and for other purposes," read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1205

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Read the third time, and passed 1205

June 26.]

Page

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petitions against, from Kirkintilloch; Glasgow; and Clydebank; to lie upon the Table 1205

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petitions for alteration, from Govan, and Greenock; to lie upon the Table 1205

Factories and Workshop Bill—Petition from South Kensington, against; to lie upon the Table 1205

Licensed Premises (Hours of Sale) (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Bowling, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1206

Licensing Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Bowling, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1206

Licensing (Sale of Intoxicating Liquors)—Two Petitions from Milford Haven, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 1206

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment Bill—Petition from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1206

Public Houses (Scotland) Later Opening Bill—Petition from Bowling, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1206

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petitions in favour, from Havant; Warsash; and Lichfield; to lie upon the Table 1206

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill—Two Petitions from Milford Haven, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1206

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions against from Doncaster (two); West Hartlepool; and Hartlepool; to lie upon the Table. Petitions in favour, from Leicester (five); Tedburn St. Mary (two); Uffculme; Cheadle; Quarrington Hill; Page Bank; Saltford; Rhydfelen; Treforest; Porth; Clutton; Maidstone (two); Litcham; Temple Cloud; Warblington; Pentre; Rhosymedre; Cheshire; Keynsham; Bontuchel; Aston; Renton; Lutterworth; Mount Sorrell; Sheffield (two); Bowling; Sandford; Yarnscombe; Helensburgh; Merthyr Tydfil; Brighton; Llanwnda; Elland; Upper Gornal (three); Aberystwith; Brecon; Brynmawr; Beaufort; Braintree; Hartlepool (eight); Rishton; Cowling; Keighley (four); West Hartlepool (two); Holbeach; London; Wellington; Kelvedon; Jedburgh; Bovey Tracey; Denton (five); Rugby; Folkestone; West Ham; Birmingham; Haggerston; New Winchester; Mexborough; Doncaster (five); Bristol (five); Holsworthy (two); Ham Street; Shefford; Newbury; Chillaton; Okehampton; Yelverton; Whitchurch; Lydford; Tavistock (four; Mill Hill; Bury; Broad Park; Zoar; Burtle; Highbridge; Weston-super-Mare; and Liverpool; to lie upon the Table 1206

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill and Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Putford; Black Torrington; and Sheepwash; to lie upon the Table 1207

June 26.] *Page*

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions against, from Leith; Kirriemuir; and Cumnock; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Leith (two); Bowling; Cardross; Row; Helensburgh; Clydebank; Hamilton; Banff; Oban; Monikie; Rattray; Glasgow; Maybole; Greenock; Kinellar; and Fintray; to lie upon the Table 1207

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Leicester; Heath Town; Liverpool; Birkenhead; Newport (Monmouthshire) (two); Netherfield; Quarrington Hill; Saltford; Tedburn St. Mary; Okehampton (two); Cheadle; Rhydfelen; Treforest; Stone Allerton; Weare; Hackney; Page Bank; Havant; Weston-super-Mare (two); Eastleigh; Pentre Broughton; Rhosymedre; Sheffield (two); Peasedown; Keynsham; Bontuchel; Kendal; Clifton; Mount Sorrell; Bowling; Whittington Moor; Trelowth; Great Torrington; Peters Marland; Yarnscombe; Bradford; Langtree; Shebbear; Stebb Cross; Sandford; Ashton; Glasgow; Nottingham; Hartlepool; Oakworth; Bogthorn; Keighley (three); Aberystwith; Caistor; Brecon; Brynmaur; Beaufort; Saracen's Head; Woodbridge; Ayr; Perth (two); Rugby; Worcester; Hightown; Lichfield; Bovey Tracey; Saltburn-by-the-Sea; Radstock; Hyde; Coate; Doncaster (two); Hockley; Risca; Mexborough; Silvertown; Croydon (three); Highworth; Bristol (three); Bramley; Exmouth; Shrewsbury; Manchester; Oxford; Beenham; Shefford; Bagshot; Lambourne; Stroud Green; Tavistock; Leeds; New Wortley (three); Holsworthy; South Marston; and Highbridge; to lie upon the Table 1207

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) **Amendment Bill**—Petitions in favour, from Llanwnda; Rhydfelen; Treforest; Brecon; and Aberystwyth; to lie upon the Table... 1208

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Savings Banks and Friendly Societies—Accounts presented, showing the Interest accrued in respect of the Securities standing in the names of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to the credit of the Post Office Savings Banks Fund for the year ended 31st December, 1899, and of the Fund for the Banks for Savings and the Fund for Friendly Societies for the year ended 20th November, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed) [No. 238.]... 1208

Explosives—Copy presented, of Twenty-fourth Annual Report of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Explosives, being for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1208

Water Orders Confirmation Bill—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Water Orders Confirmation Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 239.] 1208

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill—[Third Reading] —Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. H. S. Foster (*Suffolk, Lowestoft*) 1209
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*)... 1211
Mr. Grant Lawson (*Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk*) ... 1213
Mr. James Lowther (*Kent, Thanet*) 1215
Mr. Galloway (*Manchester, S.W.*) 1217
Mr. Gedge (*Walsall*) 1218
Capt. Pretyman (*Suffolk, Woodbridge*) 1220
Mr. Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) 1223
Col. Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 1224
Mr. John Wilson (*Falkirk Burghs*) 1225

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill—As amended (by the Standing Committee), further considered.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 15, to leave out the words 'without their actual fault or privity.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Chas. McArthur (*Liverpool Exchange*) 1226
Mr. Maurice Healy (*Cork*)... 1227
The Solicitor-General (*Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University*) ... 1227
Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 1228

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out from the words 'tonnage of,' to the word 'power,' in line 24, inclusive, and insert the words 'such vessel or vessels,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Maurice Healy*).

Question proposed, "That the words from the words 'tonnage of,' to the word trading,' in line 22, stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Chas. McArthur ... 1230
Mr. Caldwell, Lanarkshire, Mid 1231
Mr. Warr (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 1232
Mr. Provand (*Glasgow, Blackfriars*) 1234
Mr. Platt-Higgins (*Salford, N.*) 1234
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) ... 1235
Sir Edward Carson 1235
Sir William Houldsworth, Manchester, N.W.) 1236
Mr. Field (*Dublin, St. Patrick*)... 1237
Mr. Maurice Healy 1237
Sir Edward Carson 1237

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 22, to leave out the words 'trading to or from' in order to insert the word 'within.'"—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'trading to or from' stand part of the Clause."

DISCUSSION —

Mr. Maurice Healy	1239	*Mr. T. M. Healy*	1241
Mr. Warr	1240	*Sir Edward Carson*	1241
Mr. Caldwell	1240	*Mr. Edmund Robertson*	1242
Mr. Platt-Higgins	1240		

Amendment agreed to—

Amendment proposed—

"In clause 2, page 1, line 24, after the word 'power' to insert the words 'A ship shall not be deemed to have been within the area over which a harbour authority or a conservancy authority performs any duty, or exercises any powers, by reason only that it has taken shelter within or passed through such area on a voyage between two places both situate outside that area.'"—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to add the words 'or that it has loaded or unloaded mails or passengers within that area.'"—(*Mr. Maurice Healy.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Provand	1245	*Sir Charles Cayner (Barrow-in-Furness)*	1250
Mr. Caldwell	1246	*Mr. C. H. Wilson (Hull, W.)*	1251
Mr. Charles McArthur	1247	*Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, W.)*	1251
Mr. Field	1248	*Sir Edward Carson*	1252
Mr. T. M. Healy	1248		

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 4, to leave out Sub-section (3)."—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section 3 stand part of the clause."

Sir Edward Carson	1253	*Mr. Charles McArthur*	1254

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

To insert as a separate clause at the end of Sub-section 6 :—

"Provided that nothing in this section shall impose any liability in respect of any such loss or damage on any such owners or authority in any case where no such liability would have existed if this Act had not passed."—(*Mr. Maurice Healy.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Midwives Bill—Order for Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now considered."

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Boscawen.*)

June 26.] Page

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Discussion :—

Col. Milward (*Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon*) ... 1256
Sir John Tuke (*Edinburgh, St. Andrew's University*) 1258
Dr. Farquharson (*Aberdeenshire, W.*) 1259
Mr. Parker Smith (*Lanarkshire, Partick*) 1259
Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 1260
Mr. Heywood Johnstone (*Sussex, Horsham*) 1261

It being half-past Five of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Highways and Bridges Act (1891) Amendment Bill — Considered in Committee.

Clause 2 :—

Question again proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Jonathan Samuel.*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee Report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday next ... 1261

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

Shop Hours Acts Amendment Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn 1262

Queen Anne's Bounty Board—Ordered, That a Select Committee of Five Members of this House be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith, and to request that their Lordships will be pleased to appoint an equal number of Lords to be joined with the Members of this House.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Sir William Walrond.*) 1262

NEW BILL.

on-County Boroughs — Bill to amend the Law relating to Non-County Boroughs, ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Holland, Mr. Oldroyd, Mr. Lyttleton, and Mr. Griffith-Boscawen.

on-County Boroughs Bill — "To amend the Law relating to Non-County Boroughs," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 9th July, and to be printed. [Bill 270.] ... 1262

June 26.] *Page*

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]. Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 1263

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]. Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 1263

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J)—Ordered, That Walter Edward Henry Dowling, and the Reverend Charles Augustus Leveson, and Samuel Whitley Basil do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bill To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock. 1263

Scarborough Corporation Bill—Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Sections B), with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Taunton Corporation Bill—Reported from Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section B), with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS—On the Motion for Adjournment—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1264

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six of the clock.

LORDS: THURSDAY, 28TH JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Halifax Corporation Bill; West Bromwich Corporation Bill; Reports of Her Majesty's Attorney General received, and ordered to lie on the Table 1265

Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill [H.L.]; Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited, Bill; Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways Bill—Committed 1265

Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1265

Bexhill and Rotherfield Railway Bill [H.L.]—Reported with Amendments 1265

Bedford Gas Bill—Reported without Amendment 1265

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on 18th June and Friday last discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next 1265

Mountain Ash Water Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered and agreed to, with Amendments; and Bill returned to the Commons ... 1265

June 28.] *Page*

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [H.L.]; Paignton Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to ... 1265

Roe's Patent Bill [H.L.]—Read 2^a 1266

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1266

Hamilton Burgh Bill—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1266

Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill—Standing Order No. 93 considered (according to Order), and dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of the Promoters of the Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Company Bill. Leave given to present the said Petition 1266

Oldham Corporation Bill; West Ham Corporation Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a and referred to the Examiners... 1266

Brewery and Commercial Investment Trust, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Bristol Water Bill [H.L.]; Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill [H.L.]; Milford Docks Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1266

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment 1266

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Read 3^a (according to Order), with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 1266

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow 1266

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to Order). and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow 1266

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill. (No. 140); Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill. (No. 141); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. (No. 142); Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. (No. 143)—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners 1267

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICA—Telegrams respecting hospital accommodation for the troops in South Africa 1267

BOARD OF EDUCATION—Draft Order in Council constituting a Consultative Committee of the Board of Education 1267

EXPLOSIVES—Twenty-fourth Annual Report of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Explosives 1267

TRADE REPORTS—I. Annual Series: No. 2463, Honduras; No. 2464, Mexico (the State of Sonora); No. 2465, United States (Porto Rico); No. 2466, Venezuela (Caracas and District); No. 2467, China (Samshui). II. Miscellaneous Series: No. 530, Brazil (Report on the State of Amazonas). 1267

June 28.] *Page*

INDIA (RAILWAYS)—Administration Report on the railways in India for 1899–1900.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1267

LUNACY (SCOTLAND)—General rules for the government of the asylum situate at Kirklands, in the County of Lanark 1267

SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS FUND) (SAVINGS BANKS FUND) (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES FUND)—Accounts for the year ended 31st December, 1899. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table... 1268

PETITIONS.

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill—Petitions for amendment of; of Bank of New South Wales; Commercial Banking Company of Sydney; City Bank of Sydney; and Trustees of Savings Bank of New South Wales; read, and ordered to lie on the Table... 1268

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD—Message from the Commons that they have appointed a Committee to consist of five Members, to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in its constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body, and to request that their Lordships will be pleased to appoint an equal number of Lords to be joined with the Members of that House 1268

SECRETARIES TO IRISH COUNTY COUNCILS—The Earl of Arran 1268

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS—Question, The Earl of Kimberley; Answer, The Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1268

Land Registry (New Buildings) Bill—Read 2^a (according to Order) and committed.

Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill—Order for the House to go into Committee read.

The Marquess of Salisbury... 1269 *Lord Monkswell*... 1269

House in Committee (according to Order.)

Clause 1 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 5, to leave out 'Burial Authorities (Cremation),' and to insert 'Cremation.'"

The Earl of Kimberley ... 1270 *Lord Belper* 1270

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Amendments moved—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 7, to leave out after 'burial authority' to end of clause and to insert 'shall mean any burial board, any council, committee or other local authority having the powers and duties of a burial board, and any local authority maintaining a cemetery under the Public Health (Interments) Act, 1879, or under any Local Act'; and in page 1, after line 9, to insert 'The expression 'crematorium' shall mean any building fitted with appliances for the burning of human remains.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

June 28.] *Page*

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 2 as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 4 :—

Moved, "That Clause 4 be omitted."—(*Lord Belper.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, line 6, to leave out 'in such place.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

Lord Monkswell ... ... 1271 *Lord Belper* 1271

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, page 2, to leave out 'liable' to 'pounds' in line 15, and to insert 'to imprisonment with or without hard labour not exceeding two years.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 7 and 8 amended, and agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new clause:—'On the commencement of this Act any provision of any local and personal Act for a like purpose as this Act and any bye-laws or regulations made thereunder shall, so far as they relate to that purpose, cease to be in operation.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

Lord Monkswell ... ... 1272 *Lord Belper* 1272

New clause agreed to.

Other Amendments agreed to; Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 137.)

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order).

Lord Russell of Killowen 1273

Amendments proposed by the Select Committee, agreed to.

Moved, "That the Standing Committee be negatived."—(*Lord Russell of Killowen.*)

The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) ... 1273 *Lord Russell of Killowen* ... 1273

On Question, agreed to; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord James of Hereford 1274

Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

June 28.] Page

Colonial Solicitors Bill [Second Reading]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Halsbury 1279

Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

Lunacy Regulation (Ireland) Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a on Thursday next 1279

Volunteers Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (on re-commitment) (according to Order).

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out 'to one or both of the following liabilities.'"—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

The Secretary of State for War (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 1281
The Earl of Kimberley 1283
Lord Heneage 1284

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause,"

Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 67 ; Not Contents, 27.

Bill reported without further amendment. The Report of Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and in the Standing Committee to be received To-morrow.

Military Lands Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to Order).
Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 5, to leave out 'or the council of any county or borough.'"—(*Lord Heneage.*)

Discussion :—

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1287
The Earl of Dartmouth ... 1291
The Earl of Kimberley ... 1291
Lord Tweedmouth 1292
The Earl of Wemyss 1292
The Marquess of Lansdowne ... 1292

Amendment, by leave of the House withdrawn.

Discussion :—

The Earl of Neath... ... 1293
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1294
Lord Thring 1295
The Earl of Kimberley 1296
The Chairman of Committee (The Earl of Morley) 1297

Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow.

Ancient Monuments Protection Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow. 1297

Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.]; Military Manœuvres Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a (according to Order); Amendments made; Bills passed, and sent to the Commons 1298

oor Removal Bill—House in Committee (according to Order).
Clause 1:—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, line 2, after ('England') to insert ('of which five years not less than one year shall have been continuously in the parish or union in which he applies for relief.'")—(*Lord Avebury.*)

Lord Harris 1298
Lord Clonbrock 1299
Earl Spencer 1299

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 1 to insert as a new clause: 'Upon an application for removal of a pauper to Ireland, the justices or magistrates hearing such application shall, if the pauper shall assert that he has resided continuously in England for five years without relief require such evidence in corroboration of such assertion to be furnished as they or he may deem sufficient, and in the event of no satisfactory evidence in corroboration being furnished, or on being satisfied that the board of guardians applying for the order of removal has made proper enquiries but has failed to obtain such corroborative evidence as aforesaid, such justices or magistrates shall make such order as they or he would have made had this Act not been passed."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

Lord Harris 1300
The Earl of Kimberley ... 1301
Lord Clonbrock 1301

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Bill reported, without amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

Union of Benefices Act, 1860, Amendment Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee 1302

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill [No. 138]—Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill [No. 139]. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed 1302

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—BOER PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA—Question, the Earl of Mayo; Answer, the Marquess of Lansdowne 1302

House adjourned at half-past Seven of the clock.

COMMONS: THURSDAY, 28TH JUNE, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill (By Order)—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

June 28.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 1303
The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Jesse Collings, Birmingham, Bordesly) 1305
Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) ... 1307

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with viz. :—Walsall Corporation Bill [Lords]; Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1308

Birmingham Corporation (Stock) Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, without amendment 1308

Scottish American Investment Company Bill [Lords]. (By Order)—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1308

South Eastern Railway Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1308

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill—Read the third time and passed 1308

London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill [By Order]—Read the third time, and passed 1308

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 1308

London (St. Luke's) Provisional Order Bill [By Order]; London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill [By Order]—Read a second time, and committed 1308

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings given before the Committee on the Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill, 1898, be referred to the Committee on the above-named Bill.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 1309

Muirkirk, Mauchline, and Dalmellington Railways (Abandonment) Bill [Lords]—Report [26th June] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 1309

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 1309

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 1309

June 28.] *Page*

Electric Power Bills—Sir JAMES KITSON reported from the Select Committee on Electric Power Bills, That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half past Eleven of the clock. Report to lie upon the Table 1309

Dublin Corporation Bill and Clontarf Urban District Council Bill [Joint Committee]—Ordered that George G. N. M'Murdo and James W. Drury do attend the Joint Committee on the Dublin Corporation Bill and the Clontarf Urban District Council Bill on Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock, and remain in attendance during the proceedings of the Committee 1309

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP D)—Mr. HARGREAVES BROWN reported from the Committee on Group D of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve of the clock. Report to lie upon the Table 1310

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill, without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Acts, 1870, relating to East Surrey Water, Hayling Water, Maidenhead Water, Sevenoaks Water, South-West Suburban Water, and Tonbridge Water." Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Corporation of Manchester to construct additional tramways in and near the city, and to confer further powers upon the Corporation and neighbouring authorities in respect of tramways within and beyond the city; and for other purposes." Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords] 1310

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 271) 1310

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1311

PETITIONS.

Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill—Petition of the Agents General for the Cape, Natal, New Zealand, Tasmania, and the Australian Colonies, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1311

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1311

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS)—Petition from Milford Haven, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 1311

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petition from Margate in favour; to lie upon the Table 1311

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill, and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill—Petition from Milford Haven, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1311

June 28.] *Page*

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour from Hambleden; Fulham; Marylebone; Watford; Westminster; Shepherd's Bush; Grosvenor Square; Oxford Street (two); Bristol (three); Chelsea (two); Glyncorrwg; Ayr; Fowlmere; Stafford; Stoke-upon-Trent; Wakefield; Scramerston; Norham; Renishaw; Bunhill Fields; Coventry; Tweedmouth; Rugby; Llanarthney; South Bristol; Hull (three); Radcliffe (two); Wolverhampton; Wykefield; Mossley; West Cornforth; Kelloe; New Malden; Dukinfield; Stalybridge (three); Sheffield; Hexham; and Wigan; to lie upon the Table 1311

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Watchfield; Harringay; Hinckley; New Whittington; Renishaw; Coventry; Llanarthney; Stalybridge (two); Corbridge; Ramsgate; Margate; Dukinfield; Bassaleg; Mynyddislwyn; Newport (Mon.); West Cornforth; Kelloe; Weston-super-Mare; Bristol; Abbey Road; Redditch; Lancaster; Heath Town; and Wigan; to lie upon the Table 1311

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—Petition from Llanarthney, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1312

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR (HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION)—Copy presented, of Telegrams respecting Hospital Accommodation for the Troops in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1312

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS)—Copy presented, of Administration Report on the Railways in India in 1899–1900, by F. R. Upcott, Esquire, C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, Railways [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1312

BOARD OF EDUCATION—Copy presented, of Draft Order in Council constituting a Consultative Committee of the Board of Education [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1312

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)—Copy presented, of Eighteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1899. Part III. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1312

LUNACY (SCOTLAND)—Copy presented, of General Rules for the government of the Asylum situated at Kirklands, in the county of Lanark [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1312

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES)—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2463 to 2467 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1312

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES)—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 530 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1312

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900–1901)—Copy presented, of Supplementary Estimate of the additional amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1901, for expenditure in respect of Army Medical Establishments [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 240.] 1313

une 28.] *Page*

QUESTIONS.

outh African War—Hospital Arrangements at the Front—Mr. Burdett-Coutts' Charges—Questions, Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet), Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.), Mr. Paulton (Durham, Bishop Auckland), Col. Lockwood (Essex, Epping), Capt. Norton (Newington, W.), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), and Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover), and The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1313

ar Funds Committee's Recommendations—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1319

umber of Armed Forces in South Africa—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1320

eleased British Troops—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.): Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1320

oodeval Engagement, 7th June—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham... 1321

noculation of Troops against Fever—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1322

oer War of 1881—Medals—Question, General Russell (Cheltenham); Answer, Mr Wyndham 1322

range Free State—Proclamation as to Rebels—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1322

esumption of Industrial Occupations in the Transvaal—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1323

lldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties—Questions, Col. Dalbiac (Camberwell, N.) and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham ... 1324

eserve Regiment of Lancers at Ballincollig—Question, Lord Willoughby de Eresby (Lincolnshire, Horncastle); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1325

ides-de-Camp and Regimental Duty—Question, Col. Welby (Taunton); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1325

olunteer Officers' Outfit Allowances—Questions, Col. Dalbiac and Col. Price-Jones (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, Mr. Wyndham ... 1326

olunteer Camps—Medical Officers—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1327

olunteer Camps—Allowances—Composite Regiments—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1327

Jnder-age Recruits—Case of Peter Walsh—Answers, Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.) and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham ... 1327

June 28.] *Page*

NAVY—WATER TUBE BOILERS—H.M.S. TERRIBLE—Questions, Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley) and Mr. Allan (Gateshead); Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 1328

BELLEVILLE BOILERS—Questions, Mr. Arnold Foster (Belfast, W.) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. Goschen 1329

BREAKDOWN OF H.M.S. "HERMES"—Questions, Sir Fortescue Flannery and Mr. Allan; Answers, Mr. Goschen 1330

NAVY CHAPLAINS ON THE NORTH AMERICAN AND WEST INDIAN STATIONS—Questions, Mr. Peel (Manchester, S.) and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answers, Mr. Goschen 1331

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT OPERATIONS—TIENTSIN AND PEKING—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1332

INDIAN TROOPS FOR CHINA SERVICE—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1333

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION—SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) ... 1333

JAMAICA FRUIT AND MAIL STEAMSHIP SERVICE—Question, Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain... 1333

ASHANTI—INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1334

THE WAIMA INCIDENT—Questions, Mr. Bill (Staffordshire, Leek) and Mr. Hedderwick (Wick Burghs); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 1334

NORTHERN MACEDONIA—BRITISH CONSULAR STAFF—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1334

REMOVAL OF GRAVEL FROM GREYSTONES—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.) and Mr. Flavin; Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1335

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS REGULATIONS—Question, Mr. Warr (Liverpool, East Toxteth); Answer, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Bristol, W.) 1335

CROWN QUIT RENTS IN IRELAND—Question, Mr. O'Keefe (Limerick); Answer, Sir M. Hicks-Beach 1336

PENNY-IN-THE-SLOT MACHINES—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White-Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool) 1336

SMALL TENEMENTS—SUMMARY POWERS OF EVICTION—COMMUNICATION TO LONDON MAGISTRATES—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.): Answer, Sir M. White-Ridley 1337

STANDARDS FOR MILK, CREAM, BUTTER, AND CHEESE—Question, Mr. Hedderwick; Answer, the President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Long, Liverpool West, Derby) 1338

June 28.] *Page*

Elementary Schools—Examinations in Shorthand—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, the Vice-President of the Committee of Council of Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University 1338

Expenditure on the Southall Schools—Question, Mr. Spicer (Monmouth Boroughs); Answer, the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Chaplin, Lincs., Sleaford) 1338

St. Pancras Pauper Lunatics—Irregularities of Relieving Officers—Question, Mr. John Burns (Battersea); Answer, Mr. Chaplin 1339

Local Government Board—Assistant Laboratory Clerk—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Mr. Chaplin 1340

Liverpool Post Office—Temporary and Permanent Staff—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland); Answer, the Finance Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 1340

Liverpool P.O.—Appointments to Inspectorships of Messengers—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1341

Brighton P.O.—Efficiency Barrier—Case of Simmons—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1342

Promotion of Abstractors—Retention of Allowances—Question, Mr. Steadman (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1342

Greenock School Board—Children's Prizes—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1343

Ireland—Tenant Purchaser, D. Allen—Question, Mr. Murnaghan (Tyrone, Mid); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1343

Ulster Rate Collections—Question, Mr. Archdale (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1343

License Transfers at Rockcorry Petty Sessions—Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1344

R.I.C. Jubilee Fund—Question, Capt. Donelan; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 1345

Lord Lansdowne and His Tenants—Question, Mr. T. J. Farrell (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1345

Irish Rate Books—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 1346

Tarbert and Kilrush Steamers—Question, Mr. O'Keefe; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... ... ...

Arrears of Tithe Rent—Proceedings for Recovery—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor (Donegal, E.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 1347

June 28.] *Page*

CELTIC GOLD ORNAMENTS AND THE BRITISH MUSEUM—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley,) and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1348

REDEMPTION OF TITHE RENT CHARGE—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1349

WEST COAST OF IRELAND FISHERIES—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett, Dublin County Co., S.) 1350

IRISH SCIENCE TEACHERS' FEES—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Plunkett

BRITISH MUSEUM BILL—Question, Mr. Birrell (Fifeshire, W.) and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. J. Morley (Montrose Burghs) 1351

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. Channing, Sir Fortescue Flannery, and Sir Charles Cameron (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1352

STANDING COMMITTEE (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL)—MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR reported from the Chairmen's Panel, That they had appointed Mr. Arthur O'Connor to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Companies Bill; and Mr. Laurence Hardy to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Money-lending Bill [Lords]. Report to lie upon the Table 1353

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to the County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill and the Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill.
That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Reserve Forces Act, 1882," Reserve Forces Bill [Lords].
Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Military Manœuvres Act, 1879, and to give further facilities for Rifle and Artillery Practice." Military Manœuvres Bill [Lords] 1353

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES)—That they give leave to the Marquess of Bristol to attend in order to his being examined as a Witness before the Select Committee appointed by this House on Hospitals (Exemption from Rates), his Lordship, in his place, consenting 1354

Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill—[SECOND READING]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 1380
Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*)... ... 1390
Mr. Archdale (*Fermanagh, N.*)... 1393
Mr. Daly (*Monaghan, S.*) ... 1395

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Mr. Flavin, Kerry, N.). House counted, and forty Members being found present,

Mr. Daly 1397
Mr. Hubert Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1398
Mr. William Moore (*Antrim, N.*) 1400
Mr. Murnaghan (*Tyrone, Mid*) 1403
Col. Saunderson (*Armagh, Mid*) 1404
Mr. Maurice Healy (*Cork*) ... 1408
Mr. Lecky (*Dublin University*) ... 1415
The Attorney-General for Ireland (*Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.*) 1418
Mr. Thomas Shaw (*Hawick* 1425
Burghs) 1425

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 175; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 165.)

Main question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Tuesday next.

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill—As amended, further considered.

An Amendment made.

Another Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 29, at the end, to add the words 'and no higher interest than three per centum per annum shall be charged on any such note.'"—(*Mr. Murnaghan.*)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and negatived.

Other Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next 1431

County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill [Lords]—Considered in Committee; Committee Report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next 1432

Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon Monday next 1431

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill—As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered; an Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed 1431

Business of the House—On Motion for Adjournment—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1432

South African War—Hospital Arrangements at the Front—Mr. Burdett-Coutts's Charges—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1432

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve of the clock.

END OF CONTENTS OF VOL. LXXXIV.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME LXXXIV.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill was originated in the Lords.

(A.) House of Lords.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Ancient Monuments Protection	———	Report, 28 June (1297)
Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2).	———	Read 1^a 21 June (577)
Burial Authorities (Cremation) [H.L.]	*Lord Monkswell*	Read 2^a 18 June (264); Committee, 28 June (1269)
*Burial Grounds	———	Read 1^a 19 June (416); Read 2^a 26 June (1044)
Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) [H.L.]	*Lord Strathcona*	Committee, 19 June (415); Report, 21 June (602); Read 3^a 22 June (742)
Colonial Solicitors	———	Read 2^a 28 June (1279)
*Colonial Stock [H.L.]	*Earl of Halsbury*	Read 1^a 25 June (878)
*Commonwealth of Australia Constitution	*Earl of Selborne*	Read 1^a 26 June (1030)
County Councils (Elections) Act (1891) Amendment	———	Committee, Report, 19 June (415)
*County Surveyors (Ireland) [H.L.]	———	Read 2^a 22 June (743); Committee, Report, 25 June (885); Read 3^a 26 June (1058)
Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity	———	Read 1^a 21 June (577)
District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office)	———	Read 1^a 26 June (1030)
*Ecclesiastical Accounts (Scotland)	———	Read 1^a 19 June (416)
*Imitation of County Court Process [H.L.]	*Earl of Halsbury*	Read 2^a 22 June (742)
*Land Registry (New Buildings)	———	Read 1^a 19 June (416); Read 2^a 28 June (1269)
*Lunacy Regulation (Ireland) [H.L.]	*Lord Ashbourne*	Report, 28 June (1279)
Marriage Act Amendment [H.L.]	*Archbishop of Canterbury*	Read 2^a 18 June (259); Committee, 26 June (1049)
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others)	———	Read 1^a 28 June (1302)
*Military Lands [H.L.]	*Marquess of Lansdowne*	Committee, 21 June (578); Report, 28 June (1285)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Military Manœuvres [H.L.]	*Marquess of Lansdowne*	Read 2ª 22 June (742); Committee, Report, 25 June (883); Read 3ª 28 June (1298)
Militia Ballot [H.L.]	*Earl of Wemyss*	Second Reading (adjourned) 25 June (878)
*Naval Reserve (Mobilisation)	———	Read 2ª 19 June (413); Committee, Report, 25 June (885); Read 3ª 26 June (1058)
*Poor Removal	———	Read 2ª 25 June (878); Committee, Report, 28 June (1298)
Prevention of Corruption [H.L.]	*Lord Russell of Killowen*	Committee, 28 June (1273)
*Railways (Prevention of Accidents)	*Lord James of Hereford*	Read 1ª 22 June (740); Read 2ª 28 June (1274)
*Reserve Forces [H.L.]	*Marquess of Lansdowne*	Read 2ª 22 June (741); Committee, Report, 25 June (883); Read 3ª 28 June (1298)
*Secondary Education [H.L.]	*Duke of Devonshire*	Read 1ª 26 June (1031)
*Uganda Railway	———	Read 2ª 21 June (583); Committee, Report, Third Reading 22 June (741)
Union of Benefices Act [1860], Amendment [H.L.]	*Archbishop of Canterbury*	Read 2ª 25 June (880); Committee, Report, 28 June (1302)
*Volunteers [H.L.]	*Marquess of Lansdowne*	Committee, Report, 21 June (577); Re-Committee, 28 June (1279)
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension	———	Read 1ª 28 June (1302)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

No.	Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
28	Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2)	*Mr. William Moore*	Consideration, Third Reading, 20 June (516)
252	Boards of Guardians (Magistrates)	*Sir F. Flannery*	Read 1° 18 June (408)
143 230	*Burial Grounds	*Sir M. White Ridley*	Consideration, Third Reading, 18 June (390)
266	Burial Grounds (Loans) (Scotland)	*Mr. J. Morley*	Read 1° 22 June (795)
105	*Charitable Loans (Ireland)	*Mr. Atkinson*	Consideration, 26 June (1203); 28 June (1431)

No.	Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
264	Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) [H.L.]	———	Read 1° 22 June (794)
199	*Commonwealth of Australia Constitution	*Mr. J. Chamberlain*	Committee, 18 June (333); Committee, Report, 21 June (638); Consideration, Third Reading, 25 June (923)
79	*Companies	*Mr. Ritchie*	Read 2° 26 June (1139)
216	*County Courts (Investment of Deposits) [H.L.]	———	Read 2° 18 June (401); Committee, 21 June (734); 28 June (1431)
239	Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity	*Mr. H. D. Greene*	Read 2° 14 June (127); Committee, Report, Third Reading, 20 June (571)
250	*Customs Duties (Isle of Man)	*Mr. Hanbury*	Read 1° 18 June (333); Read 2° 26 June (1203); Committee, Report, 28 June (1431)
108	District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office)	*Capt. Pretyman*	Second Reading (adjd.) 18 June (407); Read 2° 20 June (571); Committee, Report, 21 June (735); Third Reading, 25 June (1023)
83	*Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland)	*Mr. A. Graham Murray.*	Read 3° 18 June (370)
231	Education of the Blind (Scotland)	*Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell*	Read 2° 21 June (735)
247	Elections (Hours of Polling on Saturdays)	*Mr. Flower*	Read 1° 14 June (127)
142	*Elementary Education	*Sir John Gorst*	Read 2° 21 June (667)
166	Executors (Scotland)	*Mr. Thos. Shaw*	Read 2° 18 June (407)
82	Highways and Bridges Act (1891) Amendment	*Mr. Jeffreys*	Committee, 27 June (1261)
98	*Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment	*Mr. Chaplin*	Committee, Report, 25 June (923)
149	*Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) [H.L.]	———	Second Reading (adjourned) 18 June (401); 21 June (adjourned) (734)
55	Intoxicating Liquors (Local Veto) (Ireland)	*Mr. Wm. Johnstone*	Withdrawn 20 June (571)
251	Jurors' Payment	*Sir F. Flannery*	Read 1° 18 June (408)
118	*Land Charges [H.L.]	———	Consideration, Third Reading, 18 June (387)
152	*Land Registry (New Buildings)	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Committee, Report, Third Reading, 18 June (401)
267	*Larceny Act (1861) Amendment	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 22 June (795)

No.	Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
259	*Local Government (Ireland)	*Mr. G. W. Balfour*	Read 1° 21 June (637)
260	*Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2)	*Mr. G. W. Balfour*	Read 1° 21 June (637)
3 167	Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others)	*Sir Donald Currie*	Consideration, Third Reading, 27 June (1226)
8 150	Midwives	*Mr. Tatton Egerton*	Consideration, 27 June (1254)
156	Money-Lending [H.L.]	———	Second Reading (adjourned) 21 June (681); Read 2° 26 June (1187)
270	Non-County Boroughs	*Sir Joseph Pease*	Read 1° 57 June (1262)
261	*Poor Relief (Ireland)	*Mr. G. W. Balfour*	Read 1° 21 June (638)
245	Public Libraries [H.L.]	———	Read 1° 14 June (20)
78	*Railways (Prevention of Accidents)	*Mr. Ritchie*	Read 3° 21 June (658)
38	Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2)	*Mr. Souttar*	Committee, 20 June (570)
117	Shop Hours Acts Amendment	*Mr. Provand*	Withdrawn 27 June (1262)
77	Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge)	*Mr. Jonathan Samuel*	Withdrawn 27 June (1262)
97	*Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland)	*Mr. Atkinson*	Read 2° 28 June (1354)
36	Town Councils (Scotland)	*Mr. Asher*	Consideration, Third Reading, 28 June (1431)
238	Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill	*Mr. Harrington*	Second Reading (adjourned) 26 June (1204)
269	Urban District Councils	*Sir J. W. Maclure*	Read 1° 26 June (1139)
45	Water Supply	*Mr. Cornwallis*	Withdrawn 26 June (1204)
14 165 257	Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension	*Mr. Harry Foster*	Consideration, 20 June (525); Read 3° 27 June (1209)

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION)

IN THE

SEVENTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED
TO MEET THE 30TH JANUARY 1900, IN THE 63RD YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

SEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1900.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 14*th June*, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

GLASTONBURY CORPORATION GAS BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

DORKING WATER BILL [Lords].

FISHGUARD WATER AND GAS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL BILL [Lords].

Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL.

Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed.

MOUNTAIN ASH WATER BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

FARNWORTH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE, COMMERCIAL GAS, AND SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS COMPANIES BILL.

GREAT BERKHAMPSTEAD WATER BILL [Lords].

HUDDERSFIELD CORPORATION TRAMWAYS (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

JARROW AND HEBBURN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

MENSTONE WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [Lords].

MID-KENT WATER BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

NEWPORT CORPORATION BILL [Lords.]

As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

NEWTOWN AND LLANLLWCHAIARN URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL [Lords].

PAIGNTON URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

PORTLAND URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

WANDSWORTH AND PUTNEY GAS BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

BIRMINGHAM CORPORATION (STOCK) BILL [Lords].

SCOTTISH AMERICAN INVESTMENT COMPANY, LIMITED, BILL [Lords].

SHEFFIELD DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

WIRRAL RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

LEITH BURGH PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL [Lords].

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (GAS) BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time to-morrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

LONDON (CLERKENWELL AND HOLBORN) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LONDON (POPLAR) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

LONDON AND ST. KATHERINE DOCKS AND EAST AND WEST INDIA DOCK COMPANIES BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL AND DOGS REGULATION BILL.

Petition from Morayshire, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (CATTLE, MEAT, AND PRODUCE MARKETS).

Petition from Daniel Tallerman, for establishment in London; to lie upon the Table.

DOGS REGULATION BILL.

Petition from Banff, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Forres; Edinburgh; Cromarty; Inverkeithen; Grangemouth; and Bridge of Allan; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS).

Petition from Tranmere, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Petitions against, from Master Bakers of Chelsea; Central Finsbury; North St. Pancras; Whitechapel; Greenwich; North Kensington; and Clapham; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petition from St. Mary Abbotts, Kensington, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT (No. 3) BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LONDON BOROUGH COUNCILS (WOMEN'S DISABILITIES REMOVAL) BILL.

Petition from Uxbridge, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY BILL.

Petition from Horncastle, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petitions against establishment, from Kirkcaldy; Dysart; Dundee; Strathpeffer; Dunfermline; and Dingwall; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Lumb (two); Rochdale; and Leeds; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Chesterfield, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Rhosygell; Aberporth; Llanrhystyd; Llandisilio; Crewkerne; Orrell; Rhiwfelen; Llanafan; Chard; Llangwyryfon; Marylebone; South Petherton; Kingsbury; Workington; Hackney; Leyton; Sidcot; Penbryn; Swansea; Pocklington; Maidenhead; Malton; Garndiffaith (three); Talywain; Colgate; Abersychan (three); Edmonton; Blaenclydach; Ferndale (eight); Ystradyfodwg (two); Pentre; Trerhondda Ferndale; Llanfihangel y Croyddin; Gwnnws Upper; Colchester; Cambridge; Lancaster (three); Victoria; Grimesthorpe; Sheffield; Evenwood; Rochdale; St. Helens; London; Willesden; Exeter; Horncastle; Dewsbury; Penrhiw; Blaenpennal; Llanbadarn; Ffosyffin; Nantycunlle; Blaencefn; Blaenplwyf; Blaencaron; Ceulaumaesmawr; Rhiwbwys; Blaenannerch; Llanbadarn Fawr; Llanbadarn Trefeglwys; Llanfihangel Croyddin; Lledrod; Aberystwyth; Penllwyn; New Quay; Llangeitho; Lampeter; Abermenrig; Llanbadarn Fawr (two); Clifton; London (two); Paisley (two); Garndiffaith; Bradford; Haverfordwest; Pembury; Kenchester; Hackney; Peckham; Nunhead; Elland; South Petherton; Colgate; Gravesend (two); Penrhiw; Wetheral; Aberystwyth; Coleshill; Downley; Windsor; Penboyn; Bettws Evan; Rotherham (two); Sheffield (four); Attercliffe; Leytonstone (three); Keswick; Llanbadarn Trefeglwys; Gwnnws; Wigton (two); Exeter; Nantcwnlle; Blennerhasset; Llangranog; Cookham; Chesterfield: Wellington; Banbury; Birmingham (two); Herne Bay; Todmorden; Rochdale; St. Leonard's-on-Sea; Plymouth; North Shields; and Colchester; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Portgordon; Leith; Bonnethill; Dundee (five); Sutherland; Kirkcolm; Nairn; Hamilton; Cambusnethan; and Larkhall; to lie upon the Table.

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS (LONDON) BILL.

Petition from St. Mary Abbotts, Kensington, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Wigton; Sheffield (two); Mynach; Rhydfendigaid; Rotherham (two); Wellington; Swansea; Winscombe; North Shields; Grimesthorpe; Leeds; Colchester; Oxford; Lincoln; Bettws Evan; Bronant; Penmorfa; Pontsaeson; Brighouse; Penrhiw (two); Nantcwnlle; Kenchester; Haverfordwest; Abermenrig; Rhiwfelen; Aberporth; Blaenpennal; Llanbadarn Fawr (two); Pensarn; Ffosyffin; Pennwch; Blaencefn; Blaenplwyf; Blaencaron; Ceulanmaesmawr; Rhiwbwys; Blaenanmerch; Llanbadarn Trefeglwys; Trisant; Rhydlwyd; Penllwyn; New Quay; Llangeitho; Lampeter; Llanafan; Ferndale (nine); Pentre; Penygraig; Ystradyfodwg; Ponterwyd; Orrell; Malton; Penbryn (two); Llangwyryfon; Haverfordwest; Llanbadarn-Odwyn; Bwlchyllan; Penrhiw; Aberystwyth (three); Caradog; and Bettws Evan; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Llanfihangel-y-Croyddin Upper (two); Gwnnws Upper; Gwnnws; Llanfihangel Croyddin (two); Llanafard; Ystradyfodwg (three); Llanbadarn Fawr (three); Penbryn; Llangwyryfon; Blaenpennal; Llangrawog; Llanrhystyd (two); Aberporth (two); Llanrhystyd Haminiog; Llandisilio Gogo; Nantycunlle; Verwig; Llanychaiarn; Caron Lower; Ceulaumaesmawr; Aberystwyth; Llanbadarn; Trefeglwys; Lledrod; New Quay; Melindwr; Gwynfil; Lampeter; and Garthely; to lie upon the Table.

TEMPERANCE REFORM THREEFOLD OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from St. Andrews, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Two Petitions from Glasgow, against proposed alteration of Clause 109; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (WHITSUNTIDE RECESS).

The following Papers, presented by Command of Her Majesty during the Whitsuntide Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896:—

1. Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Nos. 2436 to 2449.

2. Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copy of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, No. 526.

3. Malta (Contagious Diseases Law).—Copy of Ordinance No. X. of 1898 (The Contagious Diseases Law) (Malta).

4. Metropolitan Water Supply (Royal Commission). — Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the Water Supply within the limits of the Metropolitan Water Companies. Vol II.

5. Army (Volunteer) Corps.—Copy of Annual Return of the Volunteer Corps of Great Britain, for the year 1899.

6. Local Taxation (Royal Commission).—Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, with Index and Appendix. Vol. IV.

Ordered, that the said Papers do lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL FUND BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Sixty-second Annual Report, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the month of February, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Irish Land Commission under the Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Act, 1899, Section 2, dated the 21st May, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Returns from the City Marshal of Dublin for the year ended 31st December, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which Examinations shall be held for 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Eighteenth Annual Report, being for 1899, Part II. (Report on Salmon Fisheries) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) (DIETARIES).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland, under the Prisons (Scotland) Act, 1877, establishing new rates of Dietaries for the several classes of prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PATENT OFFICE.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to consider various suggestions which have been made for developing the benefits afforded by the Patent Office to Inventors [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

HARWICH HARBOUR.

Copy presented, of Abstract of the Accounts of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board from the time of their incorporation down to and inclusive of the 31st March, 1900, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 202.]

RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Muirkirk, Mauchline, and Dalmellington Railways (Abandonment) Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158A]; referred to the Committee on the Bill.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1888.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the various County and County Borough Councils in England and Wales under Sections 57 and 59 of the Act, as confirmed by the Local Government Board [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of Licence granted to Elizabeth Martin, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Royal Victoria Home, Horfield, Bristol [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER).

Copy presented, of Orders made by the County Council of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dividing the Parliamentary Divisions of Heywood, Leigh, and Stretford into convenient Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (FAMINE).

Copy presented, of Papers regarding the Famine and the Relief Operations in India during 1899–1900; Vol. I. British Districts, Vol. II. Native States [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 28th May; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 203.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACTS).

Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, under the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869 to 1889, for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (GENERAL REPORTS).

Copy presented, of General Report for the year 1899 by the Chief Inspector of the South Eastern Division [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of General Report for the year 1899 by the Chief Inspector of the East Central Division [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copies presented, of Minutes sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act for the following Counties:—County of Glamorgan (Ninth Minute), dated 21st April, 1900; County of Warwick (Sixth Minute), dated 21st May, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.

Copy presented, of Scheme for the Management of the Charity of William Price, in the parish of Fareham, in the county of Southampton, founded by Will dated 24th August, 1721 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 204.]

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (INCLOSURE, ETC., EXPENSES ACT, 1868).

Copy presented, of Fees to be taken in respect of Transactions under the Tithe and other Acts in accordance with the Provisions of the Inclosure, etc., Expenses Act, 1868 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1897 (ARMY AND NAVY SERVICE) (MEN EMPLOYED).

Address for "Return showing (1) the number of men employed in Army Services who have received Compensation since July, 1898; (2) the amount of Compensation received in all cases of incapacity through accident; (3) the amount of Compensation received in cases of fatal accident; (4) the amount of weekly wages received by all persons receiving Compensation since the above date."—(*Mr. Woods.*)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—CAPE COLONY REBELS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Cape Ministry have forwarded through the Governor to Her Majesty's Government any Minute with respect to the treatment of those subjects of Her Majesty who have been arrested for political offences as distinguished from acts of war; and whether he will lay a copy of such Minute upon the Table.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have received a Minute from the Cape Ministers respecting the treatment of rebels in that colony to which apparently the hon. Member refers; though it does not quite answer his description. Indeed, I do not see how "an act of war" could be predicated of a rebel. I am not prepared to lay a copy upon the Table at present, as the matter is still under discussion with the Cape Government.

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES — HEAT FATALITIES—ARMY CLOTHING.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask whether the War Office has taken any steps to call to account those responsible for the fatalities and casualties amongst the troops in the operations near Aldershot on Monday, owing to exposure to the great heat in unsuitable uniforms and headgear, and whether steps will be taken which would prevent such unreasonable exposure in future.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The General Officer commanding, Aldershot, was instructed by telegraph to send a full report on these very regretable incidents. He has despatched the report, and if the hon. Member will repeat his question to-morrow I shall be able to give the House some information.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—"BOXER" DISTURBANCES, ETC.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I have to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can give the House any information as to the state of affairs in China.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think perhaps the most convenient course will be for my right hon. friend the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs to make a statement upon the subject.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): Before the right hon. Gentleman makes his statement, I desire to ask him a question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether Her Majesty's Government will endeavour, in concert with other Powers, to arrange for the deposition of the Dowager-Empress and the restoration of Kwangtsu as Emperor of China; whether Her Majesty's Government have provided for the protection of the Tientsin-Peking and Tientsin-Shan-hai-kwan railways by stationing armed guards along the railway tracks; whether Her Majesty's Government will without further delay place an adequate number of suitable gunboats on the Yang-tsze and West rivers for the protection of British trade; and whether Her Majesty's Government are taking all necessary steps to prevent the punishment of Chinese in consequence of having rendered assistance to British concessionaires.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): In reference to the questions of the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. Member for Barnsley it is, I think, desirable to state briefly to the House the course of recent events at Peking, although I am afraid I cannot gratify his curiosity by a statement as to the policy of the Government regarding the deposition of the Dowager Empress. Her Majesty's Minister at Peking has been in constant communication with the Chinese Government since the attack made by Boxers on peaceable converts and the destruction of three villages about ninety miles from Peking on 12th May. On 18th May Sir Claude MacDonald reminded the Yamen of his unceasing warnings during the last six months of the danger of not taking adequate measures to suppress the Boxers. An Imperial Decree was consequently issued. On 20th May a meeting of the Corps Diplomatique was held, and a resolution unanimously adopted calling on the Yamen to take more stringent measures. It was not then considered necessary to bring guards to Peking, but the British Marine guard at Tientsin, which had been under orders to leave, was retained there. Two British ships were sent to Ta-ku. No specific measures having been taken by the Yamen, on 26th May the Corps Diplomatique met again, and it was decided, failing a satisfactory reply from the Yamen, to send for guards. This course was adopted on 28th May, and a British detachment of seventy-eight men with a machine gun was at once sent to Peking and 104 men to Tientsin. Four more British ships were brought to Ta-ku from Wei-hai-wei. News was then received of Mr. Robinson's murder and the capture of Mr. Norman, who was subsequently murdered. The British Minister continued till 5th June to urgently press upon the Yamen the necessity of their taking instant and effective steps to punish the murderers of Mr. Robinson, to secure the release of Mr. Norman, and to restore order, and informed them that Her Majesty's Government would hold the Chinese Government responsible for the criminal apathy which had brought about this disgraceful state of affairs. These remonstrances having no effect, and the situation both in Peking and the neighbourhood becoming more threatening, Her Majesty's Government on 6th June telegraphed instructions to Her Majesty's Minister and to Admiral Seymour to take, in concert with other Powers, any steps which in their discretion, which was left unfettered, they might consider advisable for the protection of the Foreign Legations at Peking, or of British subjects there or at Tientsin or in the neighbourhood. Her Majesty's Minister, after conference with the Russian representative at Peking, was empowered to support any Chinese authority capable of maintaining law and order or any measures to this end—the Russian Minister being similarly authorised. The General Officer commanding Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements was ordered, in the event of the Admiral requiring troops for service at Peking, to send whatever troops could be spared from his command, and was informed they would be replaced. In consequence of further depredations by the Boxers, Admiral Seymour called up three more ships, and on 9th inst., after consultation with the Foreign Commanders, decided to land a force and march on Peking. On 10th inst. he marched with 1,078 men, of whom 650 were British. By subsequent reinforcements the force has been raised to 2,300, containing detachments from the ships of the seven Powers represented, about 900 of them being British. The Admiral had advanced thirty miles on 11th instant, on which date he encountered the Boxers and killed thirty-five of them. The railway being much broken up, only three miles were made during the succeeding twenty-four hours, but there was no further engagement. Nine hundred and fifty troops are being embarked from Hong Kong, and the "Terrible" will leave Hong Kong for Ta-ku. The Russians are landing an additional force of 1,700 men. Sir Claude MacDonald reports on 11th June that disorders are occurring in Peking, and the British summer Legation in the hills, which was in the custody of the Chinese Government, had been destroyed by fire. Nine British ships and, it is believed, twenty-five foreign ships are now at Ta-ku. Steps have been taken to secure additional force on the Yang-tsze for the preservation of life and property. Complete accord prevails between the Powers as to the action taken by the Admiral.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): The right hon. Gentleman referred to a consultation with the Russian Minister at Peking. Does he mean us to understand that there is a closer arrangement between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Russia than there is with the Governments of other Powers?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; I had not the least intention of giving that idea.

ASHANTI—NATIVE RISING—INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can give the House any information with regard to the state of affairs in Ashanti.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe all the information at the disposal of the Colonial Office has been already made public through the ordinary channels of information, and my right hon. friend near me tells me that no information of any sort has reached the Colonial Office since this morning.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is not literally correct. I have received a telegram, but it does not contain any fresh information.

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY ACT, 1894.

MR. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that, by the London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway Act, 1894, a company was incorporated to make a railway from London through Leyton and Walthamstow to increase the railway accommodation for those populous districts, and that Acts have since been passed from time to time extending the time allowed for the completion of the railway, in view of the promoters' stated intention to abandon the undertaking unless such Acts were passed, three Bills having been introduced into this House in five years for the abandonment of the undertaking and subsequently withdrawn; and whether, as a Bill, which was read the first time in this House on 9th February last, is now before the House again seeking a further extension of time, and upon which no further steps have been taken by the company, the Board of Trade will take any steps to compel the company either to perform its statutory duty or to forthwith abandon the undertaking.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): Yes, Sir. I have received from the agents for the promoters of the undertaking a statement of reasons for the delay referred to, which I shall be happy to show the hon. Member, if he so desires. In answer to the last part of the question I have to point out that on the 25th of May the House agreed to a resolution reported from the Standing Orders Committee that leave should be given for the introduction of a Bill to abandon the undertaking. I am informed that the Abandonment Bill will accordingly be introduced forthwith.

MIDLAND RAILWAY—FATALITY IN BRECON GOODS YARD.

MR. MADDISON (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the rider to the verdict of a coroner's jury at Brecon, respecting the fatal accident to a Midland goods guard named William Burley, to the effect that the jury were unanimously of opinion that the attention of the Board of Trade should be called to the dangerous state of the Brecon goods yard and to the fact that several accidents had previously happened near the same place; and whether he will at once order an inquiry to be held into the working arrangements at the shunting yard.

MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sir. I have seen the rider referred to, and the Board of Trade have ordered an inquiry into the causes of the recent accident.

CATTERLINE EPISCOPAL SCHOOL—DISMISSAL OF HEAD MISTRESS.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Education Department has received notice of the dismissal of the head mistress of Catterline Episcopal School; whether he is aware that her conduct, character, and attention to duty have been reported on as satisfactory, both by Her Majesty's inspector and by the managers of the school; and whether, as she has accepted the Superannuation Act, and will be deprived of its advantages unless she finds another situation, he will make investigation whether her dismissal by the managers was justifiable; and if found not to be so, will he suspend the next annual grant.

MR. HAYES FISHER (Fulham) (for the LORD ADVOCATE): In answer to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question, I have to state that no official notification of the teacher's dismissal has been received, but the Department has to-day received a letter from the teacher stating that she has received notice of dismissal. In regard to the second paragraph, the Department has received satisfactory testimonials about the teacher from the managers, and a good report from the inspector. As to the third paragraph, the effect of a dismissal in regard to pension can only be regulated by the provisions of the Superannuation Act, and that Act gives the Department no power to interfere in the manner suggested.

STRANGFORD LOUGH LIGHTHOUSE.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of the refusal of the Irish Lights Commission to comply with the request of the inhabitants in and the traders within the district of Strangford Lough to provide a light or beacon in the lighthouse which has been erected more than half a century, and if any and what steps can be taken to compel the Irish Lights Commissioners to provide this light; and will he recommend an application to the Board of Trade for further consideration of the application, in view of the present destruction of the lighthouse at Donaghadee.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Since this question was placed on the Paper I have been in communication on the subject with my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade, and am informed by him that the lighthouse on Rock Angus, Strangford Lough, was erected before the passing of the Merchant Shipping Acts, and before the present mode of managing lighthouses came into existence. At that time the Irish Lighthouse Board paid for local lights out of the dues on the passing trade (a practice much complained of), and this practice was discontinued by the

Merchant Shipping Acts of 1853 and 1854. The lighting of the beacon on Angus Rock would, I am informed, only prove a benefit to the local trade frequenting the Lough, and if carried out should not be done at the expense of the General Lighthouse Fund. With respect to the destruction of the Donaghadee lighthouse, it may be stated that a light of the same character as that shown from the lighthouse previous to its destruction has been exhibited since the night following the casualty.

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION PROGRAMME.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain why the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act programme, which is usually issued before Easter in each year, has not yet been issued for 1901, and is nearly three months overdue; whether he is aware of the inconvenience of this delay to, and the probable loss it will entail on, educational establishments at the next examinations, because the usual information as to the course of studies has not been published; and whether he can say when this programme will be published, and what it is proposed to do to insure the various educational establishments concerned against monetary loss, because of the delay in publishing the programme.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: It has already been stated by me that when the programme for 1901 was under consideration in December last the Board of Intermediate Education determined to defer its final settlement until Parliament had considered the proposed legislation. At a meeting of the Board held on the 31st ultimo it was decided to submit to the Lord Lieutenant the rules and programme for 1901 without further delay, and on the same lines as in previous years. The rules and programme have since been approved by the Lord Lieutenant, and will very shortly be published. No material change having been introduced by the rules and programme for next year, the inconvenience or loss referred to in the question cannot arise.

THE COMPANIES BILL.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Companies Bill embodies the Amendments said by the Government to be required in the laws which govern limited liability companies which were placed first in the Government programme at the beginning of the session; and whether, seeing that similar Bills have been introduced every session by the Government for several years past in the House of Lords, it is his intention to proceed with the Bill in the present session; and, if so, whether he can now say when the Second Reading will be taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot name any day at present for the Second Reading of this Bill.

ORDER OF SUPPLY.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is in a position to fix a day for the discussion of any one of the principal Votes in Supply, such as that for the Home Office, that for the Foreign Office, or that for Shipbuilding.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it will be expedient to leave my reply to this question till Monday.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have to put to the First Lord of the Treasury the usual question as to the business of the House for next week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On Monday I propose to take, as is usual at this time of the year, a motion for the time of the House, except Wednesday, the 20th inst., and Wednesday, the 27th inst., which will be reserved, according to usage, for the later stages of Private Bills which have already passed the Second Reading stage. After that has been disposed of I propose to take the Committee stage of the Australian Commonwealth Bill, and the three subsequent Orders will be the Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, the Land Charges Bill, and the Burial Grounds Bill. On Tuesday I shall ask the House to consider Army Estimates in Supply, in order to provide funds necessary for carrying on the war in South Africa. On Thursday I propose to take the Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill first. Information as to subsequent Orders I will give on a later day.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): Are all the outstanding Army Votes to be brought on on Tuesday, or will some be deferred to enable a later discussion on the Army Estimates?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Army Votes which will be taken first on Tuesday are Nos. 6 and 7. In no case do I propose to take the whole of the Army Votes, because that would remove from the House the possibility of discussing questions of military policy in Supply before the end of the session, which I think would be an inconvenient course.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Are we to understand that there will be a Supplementary Estimate presented on Tuesday?

MR. WYNDHAM: As far as I know there is no probability of our requiring an additional Estimate for the war.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What I meant to convey was that it was the war in South Africa that rendered it necessary for us to get money at once.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Will the right hon. Gentleman reconsider his decision with regard to taking private Members' time, so as to except Tuesday week, when I have down a resolution regarding our national coal supply?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): And there is also one affecting the Incorporated Law Society. Do the Government propose to take the Savings Banks Bill to-night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not to-night.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Will any business except Supply be taken on the allotted days?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No Government business other than Supply is taken on allotted days.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): What Votes in Supply will be taken to-morrow? Will the right hon. Gentleman postpone those referring to the Woods and Forests Office and the Public Record Office, in which some Welsh Members are interested?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: After the Education Estimates are disposed of we shall proceed with Class 2. I shall be pleased to postpone the two Votes referred to.

POST OFFICE SITES [EXPENSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all sums payable by the Postmaster General under any Act of the present session to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire lands for the public service, and of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect the provisions of such Act (Queen's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 245.]

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL.

As amended, to be printed. [Bill 246.]

SUPPLY [12TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900–1.

CLASS IV.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,585,099, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Education, and of the various Establishments connected therewith, including sundry Grants-in-aid."

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): Attempts have been made in some quarters during recent years to introduce into the discussion on such occasions as this questions of a trivial and personal character; but the attention of Parliament has not been thereby diverted from the serious and important facts which it has been my duty to lay before them. The facts have been considered and discussed by Parliament, by local bodies, by the public press, and remedies for the evils laid before Parliament have been suggested, and, in some cases, have been carried into execution. I think that on this occasion I can best occupy the time of the House by pointing out the conditions that will have to be fulfilled if the great reforms embodied in the Code of the present year, by which a single block grant is to be substituted for the separate payments which are made for various subjects of instruction, is to have practical effect. It is a great mistake to speak of that measure, the measure in the Code, as if it were an accomplished reform. It is rather of a negative than of a positive character. The provisions of the Code will remove the obstacles which prevent the establishment of a better system of instruction, but of themselves they do not accomplish that result. Progress is now possible, but the effect of the provisions of the Code is rather to permit it and not to ensure it. Now, in the first place, the policy of Her Majesty's Government must be seconded by the managers of schools. That has not always hitherto been the case. Her Majesty's Government having abandoned the system of individual examination, many school boards and many of the Voluntary associations have rushed into the breach and have of their own accord established a system of individual examination. Bishop Butler says, "Of education information is really the least part"; but these authorities act as if information was the whole object of education, and they employ the teachers in cramming into the children a number of facts which are afterwards disgorged by the diocesan or the School Board inspector in the shape of personal examination. Her Majesty's Government believe that a system of that kind is extremely detrimental to education, and I should like to read to the Committee the observations made by one of our inspectors. This applies to Voluntary schools, but the same thing applies to the case of the Board schools. The inspector says—

> "A portion of each school's aid has been in some instances allotted to the payment of an 'organising visitor,' whose visits are quite unnecessary and not always wished for by the managers or teachers. Such visits, which, I am told, frequently result in individual examination of the old and worst type, cannot, except in the case of a bad school, do any good, and very frequently do much harm, tending as they do to throw the progressive teachers back into the old and evil path of cramming for results."

But to carry out the policy of the Government it is not only necessary that the managers of schools should be willing to co-operate, but also that the co-operation should be active and intelligent. I am sorry to say that that also has not always been the case. In the beginning of this year a deputation of rural school teachers came to see me—they were quite leading men of their class—and with them I had a most interesting and most instructive conversation about the possibilities of better teaching for rural schools. The other day I received from one of these teachers a letter in which the writer said—

> "I proposed a few days ago to take my scholars through the fields to notice the blossoms of timber and fruit trees. I had a note from my manager to the effect that there is very little educational benefit to be obtained by taking children into fields. The farmers and labourers laugh at the proposal."

It is obvious from this that this teacher's efforts to secure a better kind of teaching for the children were nipped in the bud. I should like to call attention to how very differently these things are done in America. I quote from Mr. Salmon, of the Swansea Training College, who recently visited America—

> "There is much out-door work everywhere I happened to reach Chicago during the first days of spring, and half the class-rooms of one school which I visited were empty in consequence of the children being gardening or watching the budding trees. In Central Park, New York, I saw several groups in charge of their teachers, and the sight was obviously common, for I was almost the only one who turned to look at it."

But not only is it necessary that we should have active managers; something must be done also to improve the supply of teachers. Now the mainstay of the supply of teachers is our pupil teachers' system. That system is unique. It is only in this country, in Great Britain and Ireland alone, that such a system for the supply of teachers exists. Of course, the system is so prevalent and so extensive in this country that it is impossible to change it, certainly hastily. The only thing to be done is to improve the system. But when you try to improve the system it is not only the Government but the managers of the schools themselves that are on the horns of a dilemma. If you leave things as they are, children in the rural schools can hardly ever attain to the training college, and will never become leading members of the profession of teaching, except in those few isolated cases where children of ability and energy force their way through all the obstacles that have to be encountered. As far as I know, only one or two reforms have been effected in the position of pupil teachers, since I became Vice-President of the Council. One was to slightly raise the age at which children are admitted pupil teachers up to the still very early age of fifteen; and another is the restriction of the hours during which they might be employed in the schools to twenty hours a week. Just think what that means! It means all the secular time during which the school is opened; and a child who has to work in school for twenty hours a week has only the rest of its time to carry on its education and to develop those faculties which are necessary in a teacher of the young. A further attempt was made last year to impel those interested in the employment of pupil teachers to ensure their being properly educated. But if this sort of reforms are initiated by the Education Department, or by the managers of the schools, or are carried into effect, they will destroy the pupil-teacher system in rural schools. One of the school inspectors says—

> "The naked and lamentable fact is that the regulations of the Department—the wise and humane regulations—which limit the hours of work for pupil teachers, are leading to their disappearance from the Voluntary schools. Under the School Board, which had for a long time acted upon the half-time system, and which does not reckon pupil teachers as necessary upon the effective staff, these regulations have, of course, fallen short of the previous practice. But in Voluntary schools which are staffed down to a minimum, or but slightly above it, and where consequently pupil teachers are in charge of classes, it is obviously to the immediate interest of managers and head teachers—in the daily working of their time-table—to make arrangements which will avoid the dislocation caused by the pupil teachers leaving the school for their work at central classes. And thus it comes that the pupil-teacher system seems likely to wither away among the Voluntary schools here. Managers find it difficult to obtain them, and the head teachers don't want them, and there is a substitute at hand. I fancy that my lament will be echoed in any district in England. The teacher under Article 68 is rapidly becoming mistress of the situation."

Sir J. Gorst.

The pupil teachers under the most favourable circumstances are taught: they are not educated to teach: they are simply prepared for examination. I should be glad to send to any Member who cares to see it a set of pupil-teachers' examination papers. He will see how ridiculous is the information which these children are expected to acquire; and, secondly, how ignorant they are on all the subjects on which they are taught. I think the papers will show how it is almost impossible under the present system that you can have a supply of teachers educated and trained who are fit to carry out the improved system which the institution of the block grant renders possible. I have often told the House that the rural pupil teachers who have not the advantage of central classes are not, and cannot be, so well crammed as the town pupil teachers, who find their way to the training colleges. I have here statistics which prove the truth of that. I find that in the last Queen's scholarship examinations, of the men, in the first class only 4 per cent. and in the second class only 8·2 per cent. had served their time in rural schools; and of the women, in the first class, out of 2,070 candidates, only 74, or 3·8 per cent., and of the second class only 10·6 per cent. had been educated in rural schools, thus showing that in the training colleges, where the best of the teacher's education is finished, the rural pupil teacher is practically only conspicuous by his absence. Now, if Parliament really intend to have teachers properly trained and properly fitted for the work they have to do, they must pick the children out of the elementary or higher elementary schools when they are of a proper age; they must send them with scholarships to the secondary schools as they are trying to do in Wales, and they must have a sufficient supply of training colleges in which to train these young teachers as soon as they are fit to be trained. I now come to the question of the training colleges. At Christmas, 1899, 2,904 men presented themselves for examination. Of these 532 got into the first class, 897 into the second class, 1,126 into the third class, and 349 failed altogether. Of the women who presented themselves for examination, 2,070 got into the first class, 3,992 into the second class, and 2,583 into the third class; 1,644 failed altogether. But of those who succeeded in the examinations a great many teachers failed to get into the training colleges for want of room. I find that of the men who showed a desire to obtain admission to training colleges—2,838 in number—only 1,042 got in; 223 failed not because of failure in their examination, but because of lack of accommodation, and the remainder failed because of their insufficient educational standard. The case of the women is far worse. Of the 3,968 who desired to get into training colleges, 1,575 got in, and 1,369, though qualified, failed to get in through lack of accommodation. Thus one half of them were unable to get the training they desired for themselves. Every training college in the country is absolutely full. There are two sorts of training colleges—residential and day training colleges. There is a good deal of difference of opinion whether the training in the residential college or the training in the day college is, on the whole, the most advantageous. The objections which are taken against the residential college are that the students are shut up with persons of the same age and the same education, having in view the same profession in life, that the tendency of the system is to narrow their perception, and that they fail to get that liberal education which is so desirable. The objection to the day training college is that the students are not sufficiently under observation, and that it is on moral grounds, on grounds of character, undesirable to leave them so much to themselves. Neither of these objections necessarily applies to either the one kind of college or the other. There is a residential college at Cheltenham where the young ladies who go to be trained are mixed up with the girls of the rest of the school. They are not distinguished from them in any way, and they have the advantage of belonging to a very fine high school, in which there is a very good tone, and which is in every way a desirable place for the education of young women. They do not get that narrowing of opinion which they might get in a place where they were all shut up together. Nor is the objection to the day training college at all necessary. At both Cambridge and Oxford the young men who are in the day training colleges there are generally members of colleges, where they have the advantage of association with their college companions and where they are under the college discipline. Those who are not members of colleges (and they are comparatively few) are under the Board of Studies of Oxford and Cambridge, which looks after the non-collegiate students. I was once taken to a hostel at Cardiff where there were a number of young women belonging to the day training college who were boarded and lodged with young ladies who were studying in the college and were in no respect distinguished from their companions, who were going into other professions and had other views in life, and, no doubt, they were as well taken care of as the students in the best training college in England. One would think that in these circumstances the Government had better leave the matter free, and had better leave students to adopt whichever kind of training they themselves or their friends or parents think to be for the best. But for some reason or other the State now pays, and has always paid, more for a teacher being trained in a residential college than in a day training college, and as it is the day training college which is most easily expanded, and which can be most easily made to accommodate more students, I think a very easy reform would be to even the thing all round—that the State should give a definite sum for the training of a teacher, and leave it to the young teacher and his friends to decide in what particular establishment he should prepare himself. The real fact is that there is no such thing as a Queen's "scholarship." It is not a scholarship in the ordinary sense in which a county, or college, or university scholarship is a scholarship. It is an undertaking on the part of the State to pay a sum of money to the institution in which the young person is trained, and I believe that if an arrangement were made by which the whole thing was levelled all round, you might establish two classes of scholarship. I do not know that it is so much to the interest of the State to train a young person who has taken only a second class as one who has taken a first class. It is just and right that the first class should have the larger scholarship, and if the second class students choose to go on in the profession, their friends should find something towards their maintenance in the training school. Anyhow, I am quite certain that the only way in which you can make a large and immediate extension of training college accommodation is by putting the day training students on the same footing as the residential students, and inviting the University Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge and other institutions for the education of young people to extend their day training college accommodation and so increase the number of places. But you not only want more places in your colleges; you want a greater elasticity in the curriculum of the colleges themselves. I cannot understand why teachers should all be educated and trained upon one single model. You do not do it in your university. There one man goes in for literary studies, another man for science, and another man for mathematics, and if you are going to have rural teachers to carry out any of those schemes which have been discussed during the last few months in the press, of teaching children more by observation and by a kind of elementary science than by mere reading, writing, and grammar, you no doubt require a special kind of training. At present the efforts of the trained teacher in the rural schools are not always very successful. The rural schools are chiefly staffed by town-bred teachers, who, having passed a less favourable examination, are obliged to take a rural school as a kind of *pis aller*. They generally go there passing the time until they can do something better for themselves. One of the inspectors told me he heard, in a large infant Board school, the head-mistress, giving a lesson on the rabbit, tell her class that another name for the rabbit was the hare. And at another Board school in the same place the same inspector heard a teacher inform her class that cows' horns were made of ivory, and she wrote ivory with great complacency on the blackboard. But without these extravagant instances, this is the kind of way in which the teaching is too often done by the present trained teacher. This is the sort of way in which agriculture and horticulture have been taught.

> "The scholars," says the inspector, "read books in class on agriculture and horticulture for half an hour. They then copy a portion of the lesson in exercise books or the teacher dictates a summary of it, and this is called science! Nothing is done to cultivate the power of observation, and there are no experiments."

Some persons have said that you want to have an inferior class of teachers for rural schools. No, you do not want an inferior class of teachers, but you want a class of teachers who are trained to teach in rather a different manner from that in which town children are taught. A country child cannot receive abstract knowledge as easily as the town child does. First, the children want their powers of observation, which are generally very good, developed and brought out. They want to learn how to find out facts for themselves, and, finally, they want, what they can easily do in the country, to apply their knowledge to some particular and concrete purpose. There are three types of teacher we can conceive of. There is, first of all, the present teacher, who, in his place and with the kind of children to whom his teaching is suitable, is extremely good; then there is the rural teacher, who teaches by observation and experiment; and, finally, there is the kindergarten teacher, who is to teach the very young; and I cannot see why an arrangement should not be made by which all these kinds of teachers should be produced for our children and be properly trained in proper institutions so as to be able to carry out the instruction which is best. Now I come to the children. There is no use having a block system unless your children are able to come to school under circumstances in which they can benefit by the teaching. First of all there are the infants' schools. I think the very name of infants' school is an absurdity. Infants ought not to be at school, but at play. In our country we begin our attempts at education a great deal too soon, just as we leave off a great deal too soon. I met at Whitsuntide in the Tyrol a fine young fellow who told me with great pride that he was six years of age and had never been inside a school, but that he was going this autumn after the long summer holidays were over, and then he would remain at school, really attending school, going there every day, and staying the whole time until he was fourteen years of age. I could not help contrasting the lot of that little fellow with the lot of the ordinary English country boy. He is cooped up in school as soon as he is three years old, when he had much better be playing about in the lanes or fields. He has a quantity of information crammed into him which his little brain is quite incapable of assimilating—often by the assistance of the cane—and he is taken out of school at eleven or twelve years to

Sir J. Gorst.

labour for the rest of his life. The fact really is that infants' schools are what one of the inspectors called some of them—they are storage places for babies. And they are instituted not so much for the benefit of the children as to enable the mothers of the children to have leisure to go to work. If the State chooses to establish nurseries of this kind we should make them nurseries, and we should assimilate the teachers of the youngest children, at all events, to nurses. When an inspector talks about "the lower babies' mental arithmetic leaves much to be desired," I should certainly like to punish severely any teacher who can be proved to have tried to teach mental arithmetic to babies. I should say that the age of six is quite early enough to attempt to exercise the human brain, and that at six, and from six to eight, the kindergarten system of teaching is the only one which is really suitable for these tender children. No doubt there are many children who have the good fortune to fall into the hands of women who are highly trained in the kindergarten system, and who not only do no harm to the children but do them an immense amount of good, but how many of these poor, helpless babies fall into the hands of such good teachers? An inspector says—

> "At an outlying infants' school (Flockwell Heath, average about eighty) among the hills, I asked for the help of a monitor for the babies' class. The next year I found a 'cretin' in charge of this class, a harmless semi-imbecile who had herself remained at the school among the infants until she was fifteen. When she left, the headmistress wanting someone to keep the babies quiet when she could not attend to them, and being unable to get anything out of the Board, put on this poor thing and paid her threepence a week out of her own pocket, knowing that she would be kind at all events. Thus I found an 'infant' aged fifteen one year, and promoted next year to be paid monitor."

Well, another great objection to these infants' schools is that there are so many older children in them. I think the Committee will, perhaps, agree with me that eight is a very liberal superior age for a school infant. Out of two million infants in our schools there were 3,543 under three years of age, and there were no less than 320,923 who were over seven years of age. I have got a list of the schools in which there are children over eight. In one school in Cheshire, which heads my list, there were no less than 31·8 of the infants over eight years of age. There are no less than sixteen schools which have over 20 per cent. of infants over eight, and it is the presence of these infants over eight which renders absolutely necessary that severe discipline which has been referred to.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): Are all these schools in the same district?

SIR J. GORST: Oh no, they are not in the same district. They are scattered all over England. Passing from the infant schools, I think the whole Committee will agree with what I said—and as to which I was asked so much last year—that the State having provided free education, school buildings, and teachers, the least we can expect from the parents is that they will send their children to school in a fit state to receive the instruction which the State has provided, and the children ought not to be sent to school to receive instruction in an unfit state, either through hunger or through fatigue caused by undue labour out of school hours. As regards the feeding of children it is the general opinion that this is a matter which should be left altogether to private charity, and that the school authorities should not deal with it. I got into a great scrape last year by enumerating some opinions that it was the duty of the school authorities to see that the children were fed before they were taught. I am quite willing to agree that children should be fed by charitable agencies if they can be, but it seems to me that if you compel children to go to school and compel them to receive instruction, then you have the obligation thrown upon you to make some provision by which those children shall be sent to school in a fit state. This is not a private duty thrown on the parent, it is a public duty which the State has a right to insist on being fulfilled; and, if proper laws are made and a proper administration of the law carried into effect, I believe the cases in which children would be sent to school unfed and unfitted to receive instruction would be extremely rare. One or two examples made of negligent parents would prevent the recurrence of the offence. It is not the poor parent—it is very seldom extreme poverty which causes the trouble as to underfed children. It is generally idleness, or drunkenness, or carelessness on the part of the parents which is at the bottom of the mischief, or it is greediness for the small earnings of the children. It is not, I say, the poor, but the negligent parent, who is the real offender. I believe that posterity will view with surprise and wonder the state of affairs in this matter, and will marvel how this generation was so stupid as to tolerate it. I must observe that our official statistics are vitiated by the fact that we include in the average attendances children between three and five. I hope that in future will be avoided, as the average attendence can be arrived at by comparing the attendance of children above five years of age on the book of the school. As to children between three and five, not only are the parents at liberty to send them or not as they choose, but I venture to say that the best parents will not send their children before the school age. A good mother will not allow her tender child to go to school before five. Another matter to which I wish to call the attention of the Committee is how the percentage of attendances is arrived at. It is arrived at by taking the average attendance through the year and comparing it with the number on the books on a particular day, very often the last day of the year. That must obviously lead to very erroneous results, because, from some cause, there might be such shifting of the population as would give misleading results as to attendance. There would be a bad attendance made. On the other hand, if a large number of immigrants came into a parish at the end of the year and the children attended the school, that would show a very good attendance; but I have no doubt that the errors in this respect probably answer one another. Everybody knows why the attendance is so varied. In the first place, the maximum fine is so small for neglect; and I will place before the Committee two examples of how the present law works out. They are mentioned by one of the inspectors in his report. He says—

> "I mention the following case as typical, not exceptional. A certain family are supposed to attend Paddington St. Mary Magdalene's School. There are three girls and one boy. Since July, 1897, the parents have been fined 5s. for each girl, and in their case the fine has been effective. For the son they have been summoned five times, but, as the fine is only 5s. and John earns 10s. a week helping a coster, he and his parents agree that breaking the law is more profitable than obeying it."

Here is another case in another inspector's report in London. He says—

> "The parent has been summoned, convicted, and actually fined, and (which is not always the case) made to pay the fine, which amounted to 3s. 6d., for continued gross neglect of the attendance law. 'And how,' I asked the teacher, 'is the child doing now?' 'Oh,' she said, 'she has only begun to attend this week, for she was not allowed by her parents to come last week. They kept her at work because, as they said, she had first to earn the amount of the fine.'"

Well, here is another case showing how it is sought to support the law—

> "During the last four months a colleague and myself have been the attendance committee of the Board. We investigated 317 cases of irregularity, 4,580 visits were made by the attendance officer, and after repeated adjournments for improvement we brought four cases before the magistrates. No. 1, no attendance out of 68; No. 2, no attendance out of 68; No. 3, 22 attendances out of 35; No. 4, 27 attendances out of 35. All the cases were adjourned, attendance orders being made, and the School Board had to pay 8s. a case for the luxury of bringing the defaulters before the magistrate."

It is evident that with the law as it stands a very much better attendance could be secured. There were cases in 1887 where the attendance was 76 per cent.; it is now 92 per cent., and I believe it has never been less since 1893, entirely owing to the energy of the attendance officer. The other day a deputation from the National League of Teachers waited on my noble friend the President of the Council, and immediately after that deputation, quite unsought for by me, I received from the manager of a rural school in Cambridgeshire a letter, in which he stated that he had requested the schoolmaster to work out the total of the attendances at that school. Everything was against them to start with; the mothers went out to work at a steam laundry or a jam factory. Yet with great patience the efforts made had yielded good results. The number on the roll on the previous year gave an average attendance of 98, 96, and 98, and so on. There is a reluctance on the part of the authorities to be severe, and a great deal is expected from patience and persuasion. The percentages are 98, 97, 99, and 98. They may occasionally be smaller in consequence of whooping-cough, heavy snows, feasts in surrounding villages, or scarlet fever, but there are only three weeks in the whole year in which the attendance is less than 97 per cent. That shows what a schoolmaster backed up by a good manager can do even under the present law. At Askrigg, a village in Wensley Dale, where some children have long distances to travel, an energetic master was very successful in getting good attendance. On the occasion of a local sheep-washing the vicar met a boy going to school, and asked him how it was. "Why, sir," the youth replied, "if I went to t' sheep-washing t' master would go clean off his head." Now as to inspectors. This new system will give an inspector no increase of his direct power. He still will act entirely under the orders of the Education Department, and any action of his can be appealed against; but it will give him enormously increased influence and responsibility. In the first place it will be his duty to give advice to teachers and managers of schools as to what they can do, and as to what it is expedient for them to do; and he will be particularly qualified to give this advice because, going all over the schools of the neighbourhood, he has the opportunity of seeing good work in one place which may be imitated in another. I have a remarkable case here. There has been a good deal of talk recently about school gardens; and this is a letter to the county council of Essex from a schoolmaster in Essex—

"My gardening class was first established in 1895, so it has been in operation five years. The garden is about one rood in extent, and is worked as a whole, not in single plots, by the class. The class varies in number, according to the number of eligible boys, as they must be in Standard IV. and upwards. The average number, however, is fourteen or fifteen, which is as many as one man can successfully superintend. The crops grown are those of an ordinary kitchen garden, and such as would be grown in the lads' gardens at home. About half the total area is given over to fruit cultivation, gooseberries, currants, raspberries, and strawberries. Apple culture is taught from my own fruit borders. Flower culture is not neglected, as the boys plant and prune roses, plant bedding plants, etc., and keep the lawn and edges trim. In fact, most of the work in a good general garden (except greenhouse and hothouse work) is done here by the lads. My aim is not so much to turn out 'horticulturists' as to make the lads take an interest in their own gardens at home, and to work these on proper principles. We take elementary botany as a class subject, and the scientific lessons therein learnt are illustrated as much as possible in the plant life of the garden. I may say that there is no lesson that the boys enjoy more than their Friday afternoon gardening lesson, and it has materially helped to improve the attendance on Friday. When I mention that in our local show last year (embracing four parishes) we exhibited in the amateurs' and open classes ten exhibits, and the prize record was nine firsts and one second, you may judge that our school garden is not to be despised in the local competition. I am sorry I have no lad eligible to apply for a horticultural scholarship. There is such a dearth of country houses in this immediate neighbourhood that very few boys go in for gardening as an occupation."

The inspector, spreading about his district the example of an undertaking of this kind, can do enormous good. There are many who might not have the ability to invent such a scheme, but they can imitate it. Then the duty of an inspector will be occasionally to put his veto on proposals of managers and teachers. But that veto will be rarely exercised. It is seldom that the inspectors discourage even an experiment in the schools; and if any inspector were to veto any plan which he ought not to veto there is always the Education Department to appeal to. Therefore I do not think that the interference of inspectors is very much to be feared, while their advice and counsel will be of immense advantage to schoolmasters and managers. To perform duties of that kind we ought to have a most excellent staff of inspectors. The present staff of inspectors was organised under a different system in the days of payment by results, and consisted of inspectors who looked after the schools, and of sub-inspectors who did the rough work of individual examination, and saved the inspectors a certain amount of fatigue in work of that kind. Now, all inspectors have the same functions, and might be better divided into seniors and juniors. An inspector ought to be a man of very liberal education, to have his mind and faculties very well developed, and to have considerable knowledge of the history of education, not only in this country, but in other countries; and he ought to have some experience himself of teaching. But, above all, you want an inspector of character—an inspector who has sufficient independence to dare to tell the truth, because all central authorities like to reward people who prophesy smooth things. Since the time of the prophet who announced to Ahab impending death, disagreeable truths have always been punished with affliction rather than welcomed with reward. Inspectors should be appointed for life. I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Cambridge Appointments Association, in which he says—

> "We have several applications from men who wish to be sub-inspectors of schools. They know that they could not possibly get an appointment as inspector, and therefore they fall back upon the lower-paid appointment. But as far as I can see there is no entry for them unless they will risk a long period of training. One who wishes for such a berth is a Trinity man who took a first in classics, knows a good deal of French and German, and would do his work conscientiously. But I suppose it would be rash to advise such a man to go to a training college on the chance of being afterwards appointed."

That shows that there is ample material among the growing youth out of which inspectors can be chosen. As to women inspectors, if the Committee will recollect how large a proportion of the children in the schools consists of infants and girls they will see that women inspectors are a very desirable addition to our staff. An experiment was made in the appointment of some a few years ago, and that experiment has been very successful. At present they are all of the lowest rank—the second class of the sub-inspectors; but even for such positions there are now upon the books of the Education Department a very large number of applications from very highly trained women, who have taken high degrees at Oxford and Cambridge, who have had teaching experience, and who have an enormous amount of zeal for and desire to promote the interests of education. That will show the committee that, as far as inspectors are concerned, men and women, we have ample material on which to draw for the very best kind of inspectors; and that now that the Department will have to depend so much upon its inspectors for the efficiency of its schools there is no danger of the system breaking down. I am very much obliged to the Committee for listening to this long explanation. I wanted to show that we must not rest with the idea that the reform of the present Code is accomplished, but that it only gives the opportunity of really improving our schools. I have sketched out some of the conditions which will have to be fulfilled, some of the difficulties which will have to be faced, and some of the things which will have to be accomplished before the expectations which have been excited by the new departure can be really satisfied as to improvement in the elementary education of the country.

*Mr. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon): After hearing his interesting exposition of the principles of the Education Code, one regrets that the right hon. Gentleman was not the responsible Minister for Education during the last four years, for if we had had him, a keen lover of education, who knows the principles of education, not merely to give us this exposition, but to translate it into schemes of practical advantage to the country, it would have been a great boon and a commanding benefit to all classes. But what has he done really? He has given us admirable suggestions, but he has practically pointed out no single real remedy. He has given us grievances, he has desired to do away with them, and he has applied sticking plaster to the arm of a man suffering from heart disease. I thoroughly sympathise with almost everything he has said, but at the same time he has been addressing a letter to posterity in the vague hope that that letter some day or other may reach its destination. He has told us the shortcomings of rural schools and infant schools. He has pointed out what were the reforms needed for teachers. I believe we are all in agreement with his suggestions. Already educationists have pointed out these grievances and the means by which they may be remedied. Take, for instance, the question of rural schools. The right hon. Gentleman has said, and said rightly, that it is a matter of impossibility to fill the rural schools with efficient teachers. Why? One reason is that in spite of an aid-grant amounting to three-quarters of a million, and in spite of another grant on the block principle in the new Code, most of which will go to Voluntary and rural schools, there is no provision in the Code or in any other scheme proposed by the right hon. Gentleman to enable these schools to be filled with admirably equipped teachers. During the Whitsuntide holidays I have visited several rural schools, some of them being Church schools and some Voluntary schools of other kinds, and the teachers have told me that they are obliged to keep their schools filled with apprentices and with that wonderful factor in our educational system, namely, "Article 68." Why is this? Because the teachers themselves have no power to select their own assistants. In one Church school the headmaster told me that he was invariably handicapped, and when I asked whether he could not select the most brilliant boy or girl to become his assistant, he replied that not merely could he not get his assistants from the majority of the children, but he could never get them at all, as the power of selection rested with the manager. I say that the teachers themselves who have trained the children and who know their mental power and teaching capacity, are the people who should select the assistants. Then the right hon. Gentleman has submitted another proposition with regard to these rural schools. He says the teachers ought to come from urban schools or from places where the teachers can be trained. Why cannot the managers of these Voluntary schools, who are receiving so much grant, see that these teachers are properly trained and efficiently equipped for their work. The Archbishop of Canterbury said yesterday that the subscriptions this year in connection with Church schools had sunk below the figure at which they stood in 1897. Surely with this aid-grant and the grant on the block principle the managers of these schools ought to furnish what I consider to be the most important factor—a really good teacher, one who has been properly endowed as regards education, both as to scholarship and as to technical training. But we do not get such teachers. A few years ago a committee of experts sat to inquire into the pupil teacher system. The chairman of that committee was a clergyman of the Church of England, the Senior Inspector of Schools. All the members of that committee were agreed that this system of getting teachers on the cheap child-labour principle was a vicious one, and ought to be remedied by the pupil teachers and apprentices being sent to secondary schools or to pupil-teacher centres, and prohibited from teaching until they were better trained and more intellectually equipped. Our rural schools are simply filled with little boys and girls and "Articles 68." It was reported to me the other day that in the Oxford Diocese about 40 per cent. of the pupil teachers belonged to "Article 68." That is a shameful state of affairs, because, after all, "Article 68" in the majority of cases means a female who can show a certificate of good health or a certificate that she has been properly vaccinated, and may be without any teaching diploma whatsoever. Such a system would not be tolerated in Switzerland, Germany, France, and America, in fact, in any other civilised country except our own. The right hon. Gentleman has said that in Wales we are doing something with our pupil teachers. In my constituency, and in the neighbouring division, some of the school boards have established a system of sending intending pupil teachers to our county schools, where they study for two or three years before they begin to teach. There is no sense in putting boys or girls 14 or 15 years of age to teach classes of forty or fifty children. This is not a sectarian question at all. It is simply a question of educating more manly men and more womanly women. But until you train your teachers and give them all the powers possible through education in centres and secondary schools where they can mix with children drawn from all classes, you will not get the sort of teachers who can bring humanizing methods to bear on their pupils. Then there is the question of giving money for the training of these teachers. I would vote for an even better grant than the aid grant and the block system grant. I would support the State spending a million of money in educating our teachers. After all, what would a million of money be, spent in that way, when we can spend forty or fifty millions on war? One million, if properly administered, would be ample to train our juvenile apprentices by having them sent to secondary schools. I hope the right hon. Gentleman before he leaves his office will be able to do something in this direction. We all know what a fine educationist he is, but whenever he has attempted to put his desires into practical shape he has been handicapped and crippled. He is very much like another great educationist in this country who tried to preach the same gospel—a man who was, perhaps, one of the finest inspectors we ever had—namely, Mr. Matthew Arnold. The right hon. Gentleman's words breathed the spirit of Mr. Matthew Arnold; but like him he seems to be losing faith in his own ideals.

"Let them have it as they will;
We are tired: best be still."

However, I hope in this Committee the right hon. Gentleman's plea will be sufficiently backed in his right endeavours, and not by educationists on one side of the House, as this question is altogether above sectarianism and party. Then there is the question of sending teachers to training colleges. The right hon. Gentleman says that existing training colleges are inadequate. I think the present equipment of training colleges can be reformed, and I will tell the Committee why. Most of the training colleges are denominational. Out of forty-three, thirty-five are purely denominational, and admission is generally conditioned upon connection with a particular church. Therefore, owing to the fact that our training colleges are left in the hands of denominational authorities, we are losing the best and most efficient teachers every year. We have excellent day training colleges. There are fourteen of them which are of vital importance, as being open to all. But we ought to give sufficient grants to keep the students either in a hostel or in a home. In day training colleges we pay for the training of females £30 a year—£10 for instruction and £20 for the hostel; while for males we pay £10 for instruction and £25 for maintenance. But in the denominational colleges we pay £50 a year. Why should there be that disparity? The grant for the day training colleges should be brought up to the level of that for the denominational colleges, and the denominational colleges should be freed from the provisions and regulations which debar the best Queen's scholars from entering them. In dealing with this question I desire also to suggest that we should combine in order to bring pressure to bear upon the Government. I know the present condition of things is not the fault of the right hon. Gentleman, or of the Board of Education. I know there are officials humane enough to adopt these schemes, and practical enough to carry them into effective force. What is wanted is that pressure should be brought to bear upon the Cabinet. As far as I can see, the only persons who at the present time exercise any influence are the Archbishop of Canterbury and some noble Churchmen. We ought to free our education from sectarian influences, and mould it in the highest interests of the State. There is nothing like education to raise the status of citizenship. Germany and Switzerland have seen this. In Switzerland they pay 2¼d. per head of the population for the training of teachers, while we in a rich country like Britain pay scarcely a penny per head. Let us pay a sufficient grant to equip our schools with proper teachers, and so remedy the deplorable state of things now existing.

Mr. HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): I agree that the new Code introduced by the Government is the beginning of a new system of elementary education. I think we have now had a new light thrown upon the advantages of teaching country children under this system, and we can only express the earnest hope that the right hon. Gentleman will inspire the same intelligent spirit into all these institutions. If that is so we shall soon have a new era of teaching in our elementary schools. My principal object in rising is to call attention to a very remarkable and significant omission from the speech of my right hon. friend—I mean the entire absence of any statement as to higher education and what policy the new Board is likely to pursue. We spent some time last session discussing this question, and we certainly understood that something would be done without any more delay than was absolutely necessary, and that some time in the spring the new Board would come into active existence and take up seriously its duties as regards higher education. This is the only legitimate opportunity which this House is likely to have this session of discussing this question, and I wish to take advantage this afternoon of the opportunity afforded by this Estimate to ask some questions as to the position and the policy of the new Board as affecting higher as well as elementary education. I ventured to ask my right hon. friend a question the other day* as to the powers that would be transferred to the new Board, and as to the date when it would be fully constituted. I hope that to-night he will be able to give me a more satisfactory answer than he gave upon that occasion. He stated that before long—that was the indefinite expression he used—there would be a statement upon this subject made in another place. I venture to say that if he repeats that answer to-night this House will hardly take it as satisfactory. We were given to understand last year that from the time this Act came into force if we did not have here in this

---

*See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiii., p. 736.

House a responsible Cabinet Minister as President of the Board of Education we should, at any rate, have the right hon. Gentleman, or someone who was in a position to speak with authority for the new Board, instead of having to deal with it as we have done before in a most unsatisfactory way. So far as we have seen at present, the new Act has had very little effect, and many of us cannot help thinking that the cause of education suffers very much from not having in this House of Commons a responsible Cabinet Minister representing the Education Department. We know that the right hon. Gentleman does everything he can in this direction, and we have to thank him for many improvements in many matters in connection with the new Code this year; but we should be very much more satisfied if he were authorised to speak with the authority which attaches to a Cabinet Minister in the position of President or responsible Vice-President of the new Board, and was able to tell us not only what the difficulties are, but also what is the general policy of the new Board for remedying these defects, and give us some assurance that those difficulties would be really remedied. It really comes to this, that in the present position of affairs the House of Commons has lost its control over the educational policy of the country. I do not think that ought to be the case when we have so recently passed a new Act. My right hon. friend will perhaps forgive me if I repeat this afternoon one or two questions which I put to him the other day. I hope he will be able to tell us before this debate ends why there has not yet been appointed any Assistant Secretary for Higher Education. Perhaps he will be able to tell us what line is to be drawn as regards the appointment of such an assistant secretary, and whether technical and secondary education are to be divided in the future. He may also be in a position to say whether the Government will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Departmental Committee which inquired so carefully into this question. We do not desire to insist upon every portion of that Report being laid upon the Table of the House, but I am sure many of us would like to know what the reasons are that lie at the bottom of the policy which is to be adopted by the new Board of Education, and how far the Departmental Committee recommended that powers should be transferred to the new Board from the existing Department. I think it is the more necessary because we have recently had laid upon the Table what is professedly the outcome of the Act of last session, namely, a draft Order in Council. I do not know how far I am in order in asking questions about the Order in Council as regards the transfer of certain powers of the Charity Commissioners, but I think I shall be in order in asking a few general questions. There are two clauses in that Order. The first clause relates to England and Wales at any rate, and, as far as I can understand, it merely transfers certain concurrent rights to inspect, which are the necessary concomitant of the Act of last year. Those powers are not taken away from the Charity Commissioners, but are left in their hands, and are given concurrently to the new Board. What I should like to know is this—will there be a concurrent inspector of secondary schools under the dual system, or will the new Board inspect education, leaving the Charity Commissioners to inspect the financial administration? We do not want any more inspections than are absolutely necessary, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman and the Government will see that there is no overlapping in this matter, and that there is no multiplication of inspecting authorities, because we have enough of them already. When we come to the other clause of the Order in Council we find that it is confined to Wales alone. Why, I would ask, is this transfer to take place for Wales and not for England? What good reason can the right hon. Gentleman give us why the Board of Education should not have similar powers as regards secondary schools in England as Wales possesses? I know only of one reason, and that is that there already exists an Intermediary Education Act in Wales, although it is nearly five years since the Commission reported upon the necessity of a similar Act for England. If that is the only reason I hope the right hon. Gentleman will assure us that a very short time will elapse before a similar Act is passed for this country. We have had very recently some light thrown upon this subject. We found the other day that in the view of the Government it was advisable that the powers now vested in the Charity Commissioners should be transferred to the Board of Education in respect of the City of Birmingham. I should like to know why this should not also apply to other parts. What is good for Birmingham should be good for other places. Is it not desirable that all these great educational endowments should be under the new Board of Education rather than half under one body and half under another? I hope the right hon. Gentleman will let us know in short what is to be the policy of the Government. Is the new Board to be the central authority for secondary education as well as for elementary education? If that is so, ought not the new Board to take over the powers of the Board of Agriculture in regard to education? As the right hon. Gentleman has pointed out, agriculture is a subject which has to be taught in elementary schools, but the Board of Agriculture has nothing whatever to do with the elementary schools or the secondary schools, speaking generally. They have nothing to do with the science schools where the principles of agriculture form part of the education. The only institutions in the country where the Board of Agriculture have any supervision, and where it is their duty to inspect, are those few institutions which are directly aided by Treasury grants, and administered by the Board of Agriculture. Surely, what we want is some body that contains within itself a body of inspectors with agricultural knowledge and keenly interested in agricultural affairs, who shall keep an eye on every class of schools in the country where agriculture or anything bearing upon agriculture forms part of the system of education. We cannot expect the Treasury to authorise a double set of inspectors for agricultural education in this country. If this is the case, then surely the new Board ought to take over the educational inspection now exercised by the Board of Agriculture. I do not think that the Board of Agriculture should be divested of its powers for research. We have a very good precedent in the case of Scotland, where a few years ago the ordinary inspection exercised by the Board of Agriculture was given over to the new education department, the Board retaining its powers for research and experiment. That division is perfectly feasible: it has worked very smoothly in Scotland, and I hope the new Board will see its way to adopt it also. There is another subject which I hope the new Board will lose no time in dealing with, and that is the question of evening continuation schools. For a long time in country districts evening continuation schools have been growing it is true, but growing very slowly and spasmodically, and without any proper system of encouragement from the local authorities. If the right hon. Gentleman will consult the Return of evening continuation schools he will see that the number of these schools differs enormously in different counties, and I think he will agree with me that the great variety in the numbers which exists is largely due to the fact that in some counties these schools are encouraged and subsidised to a very large extent by the county authorities, whereas in other counties they are not subsidised at all. It may be invidious to mention names, but it can be clearly shown that evening continuation schools exist and flourish where they are aided not so much by the present inadequate Treasury grants, but where the Treasury grants are supplemented and completed by the county authorities. For that reason I venture to urge on the new Department the desirability of allowing county authorities, especially county authorities who are recognised under Clause 7, to undertake the supervision of these schools outside the large towns. In the large towns evening continuation schools are on the whole very well organised, but in small parishes they are not organised in the same manner, and it is in these cases that larger local areas are required for the organisation of our educational system. At present no county authority is under any statutory obligation to aid these continuation schools. I consider the county authorities should be under some obligation in the matter, and the best way of securing that is by allowing them to administer the Treasury grants for these schools in the same manner as is provided by Clause 7 for science and art schools. I suppose we shall have no further opportunity of discussing this question during the present session. We are promised in the remote and distant future—a future always receding—the introduction of another Secondary Education Bill, but it is clear we have now arrived at a stage of the session when many hon. Members may think more important subjects remain to be discussed, and when it is useless to expect that we shall see or hear anything of another Secondary Education Bill during the present year.

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not entitled to discuss the prospects of future legislation.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I bow to your ruling, Sir. I sincerely hope my right hon. friend will be able to give us, before the debate closes, a further statement with regard to the constitution of the new Board, the policy of the new Board, and the view he takes of its functions as regards higher education generally. I cannot think that in calling attention to the higher branches of education I have exercised my opportunity of participating in this debate in any illegitimate manner. After all, elementary education, though extremely important, as lying at the root of our educational system, is amply discussed in many of its aspects year after year in this House. But we want in addition continuation schools and higher schools and thoroughly good technical instruction to complete the education of the children of this country, and until we have a properly organised Department I do not think the Committee will be satisfied with the general results achieved.

*Mr. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I desire to congratulate the Vice-President of the Council on the very interesting statement he has made this afternoon. He always gives the Committee something original, something different from what we expected, and he has acted on that principle to-day. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the various improvements he has been able to carry through during his tenure of office. I congratulate him on the block grant system and the abolition of the barbarous system of payment by results, which for a long time strangled the education of the country, and made the work of elementary teachers perfectly intolerable. At the same time I think that some additions will be required. I think, for instance, that the difference between 21s. and 22s. is hardly sufficient to be an adequate stimulus to teachers. However, I believe that we are now on the right road in adopting the principle of the systems of Germany and Switzerland. Formerly our educational system was one of verbal pedantry, and I congratulate the Committee on the steady advance we are making in an intelligent conception of what an educational system should be, and on the large extension of manual training which has taken place during late years, and the larger amount of discretion now given to managers as to the kind of education that ought to be given. I agree with what the Vice-President said as to the importance of rural children being trained in habits of observation. In America training in habits of observation is much greater than in this country. I had an opportunity of seeing something of the educational system of America. I went over the great training school in New York, the largest in the world, where 2,700 lady teachers go through a four years course in order to fit them for the work of teaching in the elementary schools. I found in one class that the subject of study was the leaves of trees, their form, structure, and uses. In another class the teachers were being taught the management of the Stock Exchange and how to handle stocks and shares. In that way education in America is admirably practical, and is carried on exactly on the lines described by the right hon. Gentleman this afternoon. Mr. Lowe once said that our educational system was the worship of inutility. That is so no longer, because I am glad to say that the Vice-President has a genuine enthusiasm for education. He has had the good fortune of seeing the resolution of the Berlin Conference, of which he was a member, carried into effect—namely, that the half-time age should be raised to twelve. I also congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the Bill passed by my hon. friend the Member for South Shields last session, to which he rendered valuable assistance—namely, that children in the agricultural districts should remain at school in winter time up to the age of thirteen. I also congratulate him on what, I think, is a very good departure—namely, the grafting of a system of higher education on our present elementary school system. That, I think, is eminently practical, and will provide exactly what is required by the children of what I may call the intelligent artisan classes. I think, however, the limit of age ought to be extended to sixteen or seventeen years. I also congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the great extension of evening continuation schools. That is a question in which I take a very deep interest. Many years ago I myself carried through the House unanimously a resolution in favour of establishing evening continuation schools. At that time the total attendance was only 30,000; now it is 435,000. That is a very gratifying increase, but we have still too many children leaving school altogether at twelve or thirteen, and forgetting nearly all they have learned. But there is no comparison even yet between our system of education and that of Germany. The technical schools of Germany are most wonderful institutions, and to prepare for them the children pass through a long period of continuation schools up to the age of sixteen or seventeen. I have made these remarks on the general question with a view to congratulating the Vice-President, but I desire now to make a few criticisms, not so much on the right hon. Gentleman personally as on the defects which spring out of our dual system of education. I will require to ask the indulgence of the Committee for a few minutes while I endeavour to show some of the results of the administration of the Education Acts of this country by the present Government, for I hold that under the administration of the present Government the defects of the dual system have been greatly aggravated. The fact is that clericalism in England is gradually producing similar results in this country as it has produced in France and most other Continental countries. Clericalism is now in control of a large portion of the education of this country. It is drawing its bands tighter and tighter, and it is coming more and more into collision with the convictions of the masses of the people, and often with the convictions of the teachers themselves. I am aware I cannot now discuss the foundations of our system of education, but I can discuss the question of administration. I allege that the law has been strained in favour of clerical pretensions. There is much more friction in the country now than there was a few years ago, and this friction has chiefly occurred among what I may call the Protestant and Nonconformist sections of the country. Two and a half millions of children are now being educated in clerical schools. I must make a protest against what I conceive to be an abuse of the Education Act—an abuse which, when that Act was passed by the Liberal Government in 1870, it was never intended should be tolerated. It has become a customary thing to march the children of Nonconformists, as well as other Protestant children, into church to attend what in some cases is called "the service of the Mass." I have had several cases brought before me in which the whole school is expected to march to Mass on saints' days, which are very numerous in some schools. Now, I hold that that is a colourable evasion of the law. I do not think it is according to law, although the Vice-President of the Council has repeatedly stated in this House that the Government or the Education Board has no right to interfere. I think that was not the view taken ten or twenty years ago, and I do not think it is the view that will be allowed to be taken ten or twenty years hence. I was challenged by the First Lord of the Treasury, on the day before the adjournment for the holidays, to give instances of such things. I gave one instance, although I had not prepared myself with all the detailed facts. But I have now a list of many cases, which, if necessary, I can give to the House, where children are marched to these services of the Mass. Out of a large number I select a few—

> "ALL SAINTS', HARLESDEN.—Children taken every saint's day to Eucharist service, which is another name for the Mass.
>
> "HASCOMBE VOLUNTARY SCHOOL. — Children sent to church every Tuesday in Lent.
>
> "BERKHAMSTED, AND OTHER PLACES.—Children marched in procession to a service of a highly ritualistic character without the opportunity being given to the parents to object.
>
> "ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S, BRIGHTON.—Two thousand children from the National schools marched once a week to hear Mass in a Church of England school.
>
> DORCHESTER, OXFORDSHIRE.—The scholars marched to a High Church mission without the permission of the parents."

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): The hon. Member says "without the permission of the parents." Did the parents object?

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: The children were directed to go, and the parents were not asked whether they wished them to go or not.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. Member how he makes the Board of Education responsible for these practices?

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I have already intimated my opinion that it is a misuse of the Education Act of 1870. I am quite aware that the Board of Education denies that it has any power in the matter. However, I will not press the subject, except to repeat that in my opinion it is an abuse of the Act of 1870, and that there should be sufficient protection for the children against such practices as these. It is alleged that the Conscience Clause protects children from compulsory attendance at these services. I am assured it is not so in practice. I am told that in many ways children are penalised for non-attendance, so that poor parents dare not forbid them. They often hold their houses on sufferance from large proprietors who are influenced by the vicar. I will give two or three specific cases in which the Conscience Clause has been abused—

"LONGBRIDGE DEVERILL, WILTS.—A man and his wife came to work for a local farmer, and attended the Primitive Methodist chapel. The children attended the Church of England school, the only one available. They claimed the Conscience Clause, to the astonishment of the teachers and managers. At the end of the school year the eldest boy obtained one of the vicar's prizes (which was a prayer book) On saints' days the school was closed, and the children were taken to church, but this boy was set to work to clean out the school water-closets, etc. This is the spirit shown in that village and in many others in Wiltshire to-day, where the priests are members of the E.C.U. and other such societies.

"DEVIZES, WILTS (*The Rev. J. Day*).—There are nine hundred Nonconformist Sunday school scholars in Devizes. Five hundred of them at least are compelled to attend Roman Catholic or Anglican day schools, mostly Anglican. Sacramentarian teaching, it is very well known, is directly given in the day schools here. Not long ago one of my Sunday scholars wanted to be a teacher in St. James's School. I missed him from my Sunday school, and when I inquired, the mother said that he was obliged to go to church.

"LUDLOW.—The rector is a High Churchman. Many children of Nonconformist parents attend his school. Saints' days are regularly observed, and on many of them the children are marched to the parish church. To-day, for instance, being Ascension Day, he has all the children taken to church. The district visitors do their best to induce the parents to send their children to the National school, and to my knowledge persuaded a woman close by my house to take her children from the British school, telling her that her children were being taught heretical doctrine.—(*W. O. Robinson.*)

"CAMELFORD, CORNWALL. — Church of England school here with 250 scholars; three-fourths of them are children of Nonconformists. A general holiday is given on Confirmation day, Ash Wednesdays, and other Church festivals, but a great fuss is made if a scholar stays away to attend a service at any of the Nonconformist places of worship. No child can become a pupil or enter the teaching profession without first becoming a communicant, and this has taken some from our churches and is a great cause of annoyance.—(*Thomas E. Wakefield.*)"

I will now give a still stronger case, the particulars of which were collected by Mr. Hirst Hollowell—

"I was written to by a small farmer in Elton, Derbyshire, not long ago, and he said that he had demanded the Conscience Clause at the Church of England school for his children, with the result that for several mornings they were kept shut in a small cloakroom for three-quarters of an hour in the suffocating air without education. At my request he demanded different treatment, and got it; but the fact that his children were treated in the way they were shows the spirit in which the Conscience Clause is often carried out. At Thrapston, Northamptonshire, a mother came to me and said she was a Baptist, but, having to send her child to the Church of England school, the only one in the town, she sent a request that her child should not be taught the Creed or Catechism. In spite of this both were taught to her, and one day the child, in school, said, 'Please, teacher, mother says I am not to be taught this.' Before the whole school the teacher answered, 'Oh, your mother does not believe in the Catechism, then. What does she believe? Does she believe in the devil?'"

The Rev. J. T. Horne, Crewe, writes on 17th January, 1900—

"Many Free Churchmen in the town are subject to the indignity of having their children marched to the Established Church for the purpose of being taught sacramentarian doctrines before the school work proper is commenced."

St. Barnabas, Crewe, is a church where this practice is carried on. In reply to a complaint, the Education Department said, in a letter dated 26th April, 1900—

"With regard to religious instruction I am to invite your attention to Section 7, Sub-Section 1 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870."

A question was put in the House of Commons by Mr. C. P. Trevelyan as to whether it was legal for school managers to march scholars to religious worship during school hours without first obtaining the permission of the parents. The reply was to the effect that—

"The practice of occasionally taking scholars to places of worship during the time set apart for religious instruction has never been objected to by the Committee of Council, and is in their opinion legal."

At any rate the country is getting to clearly understand how the law is being carried out. I wish to ask the Vice-President whether it is legal for the Anglican clergy who teach the Mass and the Confessional to remove teachers from their schools who refuse to teach such doctrines? I have letters from National School teachers telling me this is the case. One informs me that the vicar threatened to dismiss him unless he joined the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. The insecurity of the tenure of Voluntary teachers makes them the slaves of the parish clergyman. Mr. Jackman, president of the National Union of Teachers, gives some deplorable cases of arbitrary eviction. He mentions that a mistress was dismissed because she would not attend "Early Communion"; a master was dismissed because he attended evangelical services in the neighbouring village; another because he refused to chant the psalms; another because he refused to sit in the choir, and another because he managed the village library. Surely it is time this tyranny should be put an end to. I am informed that there are 2,700 ritualistic clergy who have complete control of 2,700 Voluntary schools. Another grievous abuse is that by order of the Department considerable numbers of Protestant children are obliged to attend Roman Catholic schools owing to the absence of Board schools with free education. It is generally supposed that elementary education is now free, but this is a delusion in some places so far as Protestants are concerned. At Southport the parents of 1,200 children applied for free places, and on 19th November, 1896, the Department directed 300 of these children to find free places in St. Mary's Roman Catholic school and the Dean Cooke Roman Catholic Memorial School, and informed 300 more that they must wait until a new Church of England school was built in the Marshside district. Nearly all the children in question are of Protestant families, and most of them Nonconformists. Claims for 406 free places were sent in at Chorlton-cum-Hardy. At the request of the Education Department the school attendance officer of the district council made an investigation. Subsequently a notice was issued by the Department requiring 142 new free places. This notice expired on 20th January, 1900, but as yet nothing has been done. The Department in this case indicated that there were 158 free places in St. Augustine's Roman Catholic School, and it has reduced the claims from 406 to 142 partly on the ground that there are these places in the Roman Catholic school. The general policy seems to be that while there is any spare room in Roman Catholic schools there is no necessity to build schools for Protestant children.

SIR J. GORST: It is not the policy; it is the law.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: Well, it is entirely opposed to the feeling of the country. At Levenshulme all parents of children in and above Standard II., applying for free education, were informed that free places would be provided for their children at St. Mary's, Levenshulme. This is a Roman Catholic school. The parents were individually addressed by the Department, and Hilda Margaret Harrison was one of the children so directed to attend. At Clayton-le-Moors, near Accrington, six parents received letters from the Department directing them to send their children to St. Mary's Roman Catholic School. Amongst them were Mr. D. Bashall, Mr. J. H. Hacking, Mrs. S. A. Griffiths, and Mr. J. Aldritt, who objected to send their children to Roman Catholic schools. Thirty-two applications for free places were made at Rugby. The Education Department replied that there were free places at the Roman Catholic schools. It was rejoined that the parents were Protestants, but the Department again stated that the Roman Catholic schools contained the only places available. I assert that this is an intolerable abuse, and is done under the clerical pressure which is brought to bear on the Education Department. The High Anglicans much prefer that children should be sent to Roman Catholic schools than to Board schools, and I am informed that now under the School Board system of London considerable numbers of Protestant children are forced into Roman Catholic schools. I quote from a letter I received last year from a London Board School teacher—

> "The Romish schools in London are swarming with Protestant children, who are being indoctrinated and trained at first hand by Romish teachers, not at second hand, as in the Church of England schools. How can this be proved? By asking for a Return of Protestant children who are attending Roman Catholic

schools in the London School Board district. Once in these schools, we know what will happen. How, then, have these children got into Romish schools? Not certainly by the wish of their parents, but against it. They are driven into these schools by the direct action of the employees and officials of the London School Board. This is the process. A poor working man's child presents himself or herself for admission to a Board school. The signs of the parents' hard lot are visible on the child. Though clean, his or her clothes are not so good—they are most likely patched, and not cut in the latest fashion—as the poor hard-worked mother has been the tailor. The superior head teacher looks at the child, sees at a glance the class it belongs to, and does not consider it fit companion for the well-clad children of the clerks and tradesmen, whose children are getting a superior education for nothing at that school. So the superior head teacher shakes his or her head, and, under one pretence or other, illegally refuses to admit the child. The visitor then comes round and finds the child not in attendance. The mother reports the refusal. The visitor then, instead of reporting the refusal to headquarters, as he is bound to do, for his own ease, or to please the teacher, suggests the Romish school. The poor parents, harried by the school board, are driven, for the sake of peace, to send the children to the last place they would otherwise wish them to go."

The right hon. Gentleman, I perceive, does not believe the truth of this statement. I hope means will be taken to verify it.

SIR J. GORST: I do not disbelieve the statement. I say that is a question affecting the gentlemen composing the school board.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: Let me go to another point—the use to which Anglican training colleges are put by the extreme clerical party. I do not know how far I will be allowed to advert to this question, but I may point out that nearly all the certificated teachers for Voluntary schools are trained in denominational residential training colleges, the great bulk of which belong to the National Church. There are forty-four residential training colleges and only fourteen day training colleges, so that many Board School teachers are also taken from the former; and I wish to point out to the House that the examining bodies of these colleges can lay down what rules they choose for the entrance of students. They can exclude altogether Protestant Nonconformists unless they abandon their faith; but they may go further than this. I strongly suspect they have the power of excluding even Protestant Churchmen, because I find that the heads of some of these colleges are Ritualists, members of the English Church Union and the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. The principal of Culham College in the Oxford diocese is a member of Lord Halifax's Society, the English Church Union; so is the chaplain of Truro College. The National Society undertakes to examine the candidates for admission to these colleges on religious knowledge, and the majority of its examiners I am told are Ritualists believing in sacerdotal doctrines, and the Rev. Canon Brownrigg, its general secretary, is a member of the English Church Union and formerly of the Holy Cross Society.

*SIR F. S. POWELL (Wigan): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Gentleman, but I cannot hear a word he is saying.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I was saying that the Rev. Canon Brownrigg, the general secretary, is a member of the English Church Union and formerly of the Holy Cross Society.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I do not know what the religious views of these gentlemen have to do with the Board of Education Vote.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I bow to your ruling, Sir, and will merely ask the right hon. Gentleman whether even should these colleges believe in auricular confession he has a right to offer advice——

SIR J. GORST: No; none whatever.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: And I wish to know from the Vice-President whether it is competent for the examining body to exclude from any training college Protestant Churchmen who refuse to profess faith in auricular confession; or is the Department powerless? This is a vital question for the future of this country. I wish to ask whether the large grants which the Education Board gives to Anglican residential colleges will be withheld if they recommend the students to go to confession, as is done in several theological colleges?

SIR J. GORST: No.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: Then I would like to know what is the meaning of this article in the Day School Code dealing with admission into training colleges. Article 118 (page 27, Code of Regulations)—

> "The Department may refuse to recognise in a training college any student who has, subsequently to the publication of the list of Queen's scholars, signed an engagement to enter another training college without the written consent of the authorities of the latter college. In other respects the authorities of each college settle their own terms of admission."

And, again, what is the force of Article 119—

> "Upon proof by the authorities of any college that candidates have not fulfilled the conditions signed by them on admission into the college, the Department may refuse to grant parchment certificates to such candidates, or to recognise them as certified teachers"?

SIR J. GORST: The conditions to which the hon. Gentleman refers are the conditions which shall be required in the teacher.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I hope it may be so, but it is put down here in the most extreme form. May I further ask the Vice-President if the cognisance of the Department extends to the manuals of history taught in training colleges? Is it held that any version of English history, however falsified to suit Ritualist prejudices, may be drilled into the pupils at these colleges? This is no imaginary evil. A class of historians has recently appeared who unite in one aim, that is, to disparage the Protestant Reformation, and to vilify the reformers of the sixteenth and the Puritans of the seventeenth century. I wish to know if the Department has anything to say about historical teaching, concerning which that accurate historian, Mr. J. Horace Round, states—

> "The matter becomes really serious when our schools are flooded, through the agency of the clergy, under the guise of faithful history, with treatises in which notorious facts are either ignored or explained away."

Is the Vice-President aware that the Archbishop's chief inspector of religious knowledge in training colleges holds up to admiration in his text book absolutism in Church and State, and praises as great Englishmen Archbishop Laud and Charles I., while he holds up to contempt the reformers of the sixteenth century, and Puritans like Cromwell, Hampden and Milton in the seventeenth? This is an age of Imperialism. The present Government represents the Imperialistic spirit. It plumes itself on binding the colonies to the mother country by the closest of ties. It also wishes, in which I entirely agree, to cement a cordial alliance with our kinsmen in the United States. A great Anglo-Saxon confederation looms in the distance as an ideal which fires the imagination of millions. Is this likely to be brought about by insulting the memory of the Puritan settlers in New England; by describing the vast Protestant communities of America, Canada, and Australasia as "Protestant heretics"; by training up the next generation of Englishmen to despise the men who founded the great Commonwealths across the ocean? The best blood of the New World came of the victims of priestly tyranny in this country. The men of the "Mayflower" are held in reverence both in the United States and in Canada, and here we have a reactionary school of clericalism insulting their memory and holding up priestly bigots to the admiration of the rising generation. Will not the same result happen in this country as in France? The Dreyfus case shows the lengths to which priestly bigotry will go. France is divided into two nations—the clerical and the anti-clerical—and each tries to destroy the other. So it is in Italy; so it is fast coming to be into every European country. Are we to see England rent into clerical and anti-clerical through the abuse of our national system of education?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman must really address himself to the question before the Committee.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: Then I will not pursue that, but will turn to the school board question.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Board of Education has no control over that. The school board depends upon the electorate.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I will ask your ruling upon this, Sir. Suppose a school board breaks the education law by requiring a catechism to be taught, is there no power in the Executive to require the Board to comply with the law?

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Gentleman alleges that there is some power in the Board of Education which the Board has not exercised, and that the law has been broken in any particular, of course the hon. Gentleman is entitled to go into it. I understood the hon. Gentleman to complain that in certain school boards certain gentlemen hold certain religious views. Clearly the Board of Education has nothing to do with that. That has nothing to do with the Education Vote.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: The Liverpool School Board endeavoured to introduce a catechism into the Board schools. When the Vice-President was asked whether it was legal, he replied that it was so because not distinctive of any denomination. I altogether deny this construction of the Act of 1870. It forbids all formularies distinctive of particular denominations. This catechism was based upon one published under the auspices of the Free Church Council—in my opinion an excellent compendium of Bible teaching, yet I hold it was a colourable evasion of the Act of 1870 to teach it in Board schools. I am told it has now been withdrawn. A similar attempt has been made to introduce catechetical teaching at a board school at Seacombe, in Cheshire; and at the Board school at Church Coppenhall, near Crewe, the rector, who was chairman of the school board, displayed the parish almanac in the Board school, containing the following statements—

> "Registration means that a child of wrath has been born into the world. Holy baptism means that your child is born again of water and the Spirit. We are not Christians until we have been christened or baptised.
>
> "The supernatural powers entrusted to the first Apostles for the benefit of men's souls, and the authority delegated to them by Jesus Christ, are still given to every bishop and priest at his ordination. The clergy of the Church are the true successors of the Apostles in this kingdom.
>
> "The Church of England is a true portion of the Catholic Church, being the same Church as existed in this country before the Reformation. She never calls herself Protestant—a word we must carefully avoid if we would be true to our spiritual mother.
>
> "Confessions are received every Saturday evening from 7.30 to 8.30, when the rector will be found in the Church, and at other times by appointment."

In reply to a question I put, the Vice-President replied as follows—

> "My attention has been called to this almanac by the hon. Member in question. The Education Department does not seem to have any power to interfere in the matter. . . . The only thing the Education Department have power to prohibit is a catechism or a formulary. An almanac is neither the one nor the other."†

SIR J. GORST: I think the hon. Gentleman should also in fairness state that the instant attention was drawn to the almanac it was taken down on representation being made.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: It would not have been taken down but for the question being raised in this House. I will say in conclusion that the administration of the Education Acts is thoroughly partisan under the present Government. It is inspired by an unworthy jealousy of the School Board system, and is directed by the clerical party led by the small body of High Churchmen who co-operate with the hon. Member for Rochester (Viscount Cranborne), and the hon. Member for Greenwich (Lord Hugh Cecil). The personal opinions of the Vice-President are much more liberal. He is an excellent educationalist. Were he not hampered and trammelled by his clerical supporters he would administer the Department in a liberal and progressive manner. But we are bound to make our complaints to him, as he alone in this House represents the Education Department; and I hope that ere this debate concludes he will give some reply to the various cases of complaint we bring against the administration of his Department. I move to reduce the salary of the Vice-President by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Vice-President of the Council."—(*Mr. Samuel Smith.*)

SIR J. GORST: The duty of the Education Department is to keep itself entirely clear of religious controversy. Its functions in regard to the religion which is taught in denominational and School Board schools are of the most limited character. The Department has only two functions to perform. One is to see that the Conscience Clause is substantially observed, that is to say, to take care that every parent who desires in a denominational school or in a Board school to withdraw his child from the religious instruction which is given is not intimidated, but is really at liberty to withdraw the child. With the religious instruction given the Education Department has nothing whatever to do; and if it were to interfere and to dictate to the Roman Catholics, for instance, what particular religion they should teach, or to the Wesleyans or the clergy of the Church of England what particular religion they should teach, it would be entirely transcending the functions committed to it by Parliament, and would be guilty of a gross dereliction of duty. As far as I know, the hon. Member has adduced no instance in which a parent during the administration of the present Government has been practically unsupported by the Education Department in his right to withdraw his child from any religious instruction. The other duty in relation to religion thrown upon the Board of Education arises under the prohibition under the law of school boards from teaching a catechism or formulary of a distinctly denominational character. The Act provides that where complaint is made that such a catechism or formulary is being taught the Education Department shall decide judicially whether such catechism or formulary is of a denominational character, and the decision of the Education Department is final. I am very glad to say that in my time a case has never arisen for judicial decision, though there have been threatenings in that direction. There was what appeared to be a serious case at Liverpool, where a catechism was framed by a school board, and at one time it looked very much as if a judicial decision would be required from the Department whether that particular catechism was or was not a violation of the law. Of course, had it become the duty of the Department to decide that question, the Department would have used its best ability in arriving at a final decision. But, happily, we were not required to do this, for the local school board withdrew the catechism. At the present time there is a case pending—I do not know whether it is the case the hon. Member has referred to—in which certain members of a school board have complained that the use of the Apostles' Creed and "My duty to God and to my neighbour," taught in a Board school, is a violation of the clause. That is alleged by certain members of the Board, while other members take an opposite view, and the question is, I believe, nearly ripe for decision. The last time I had to do with it I directed the parties to make any addition they desired to the correspondence that had taken place, and it would then become the duty of my noble friend the Lord President of the Council and myself to come to a judicial decision to the best of our ability. It appeared to me in my innocence, before I was called upon to decide judicially, that our "duty to God" was a proposition upon which there had been agreement among all creeds, and that "our duty to our neighbour" expressed exactly the sort of opinion Pagan philosophers of old would have maintained. If the question does come up for decision I will try to disabuse my mind of all preconceived prejudices, and, in conjunction with my noble friend the Lord President of the Council—and possibly with the assistance of the law officers of the Crown—we will come to the best final decision we possibly can. But that has never been done yet; the Department has never yet exercised this very serious power conferred by the Act. These are the only two particulars upon which the Board of Education has a right to trouble itself or take any side whatever in religious controversies in regard to school teaching. As to criticising an almanac or a history of the Prayer Book, or giving an opinion on the ritualistic proclivities of teachers or managers, in any attempt of that kind we should be guilty of a gross violation of the duty of the Department under the Act. The hon. Member for Flint has referred to instances of Protestant children being sent to Roman Catholic schools. But that is according to law. As the law stands, a parent is entitled to a free place in a local school, and, on the other hand, a school board has no right to build additional school accommodation so long as free places are to be found in existing schools. The Education Department does not take cognisance of the religious denomination of the school; all it does is to ascertain through its inspector whether there are free places in the school, and as long as there are free places we have no jurisdiction. It is not for me to say whether that is a satisfactory state of the law; if in the opinion of the hon. Member it is not, then his efforts should be directed to inducing Parliament to pass a law providing for every child a free place in a school of the denomination to which the parent belongs, and that might alter the present state of things. But as the law stands, all the Department can do is to give the child a free place in a school where such place exists, and not until all the places are filled has the Department power to require a school board to build an additional school.

---

† See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxix., page 1100; refer also to Vol. lxxx., page 43.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I understand, according to your ruling, it is impossible to go to what may be called the bottom of the question, and I will only detain the House for a few moments in regard to what fell from the hon. Member for Flint. He referred on this occasion, and also on a previous occasion, to a large number of instances of grievances, which, of course, it is quite impossible to test on the spur of the moment. He referred on this occasion to a book which he quoted from on the last occasion, and he repeated the accusation against that book, which he said is used, or intended to be used, in schools and training colleges, that it is fundamentally opposed to the whole tenor of the Reformation. Of course, it would not be in order to comment on what the hon. Member said on a previous occasion, but I may be allowed to say that I have had an opportunity of looking into the matter he instanced on the last occasion, and the impression left on my mind is altogether different from what he said in regard to the book. He mentioned one foolish book which he said was written by the principal of a training college, but he did not tell the House that the author had ceased to be principal for sixteen years, and that it is a book which is exceedingly difficult to get. In answer to my application the publishers stated that they had only some copies in quires, and I am told by the National Society, though millions of books pass through their hands for purposes of education, they have never had any application for this particular book. I think the impression the hon. Member gave was that it was an extraordinary kind of book, which was being used in a training college.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I beg pardon, I did not say that. I merely stated that that book represented the teaching in that particular training college.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Sixteen years ago. The hon. Member referred to another book in the Church History series, and commented severely on the fact that it made no mention of the reign of Queen Mary. Had he studied the book more closely he would have found that the reign of Queen Mary is altogether irrelevant to the "History of the Prayer Book." The writer refers to the first Prayer Book published during the reign of Edward VI., and mentions several reasons why it caught the mind of the English nation. The first reason is—

> "It was Scriptural. The English people have always loved the Bible, and the new translations of that Book in strong, intelligible English had deepened the feeling of reverence for it; the country welcomed the fuller and more systematic use of the Book, and the discarding of apocryphal and childish legends."

The truth is that the author holds the opinion which has always been recognised, that the Puritans of the seventeenth century were mistaken men, and that the Church of England suffered at their hands. That is an opinion perfectly loyal to the Church of England, and one perfectly proper to teach. Let the Committee observe critically the position they are put in. The hon. Member comes forward and makes accusations. When we try to test the charges we find they bear a different interpretation from that he puts upon them. Although no one disputes that the hon. Member is perfectly sincere, his recklessness of assertion is such that it would be foolish for the Committee to accept on his authority all his statements or any of his statements with reference to the books taught in the schools. He also spoke of breaches of the law. I was surprised to find that he seemed to think the Liverpool Catechism had a Romanising tendency. As a matter of fact this particular catechism was taken out of the Nonconformist catechism drawn up by distinguished Nonconformists.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I agree with the noble Lord, and I am glad to hear him speak so well of it, but I hold that the teaching of the catechism in a Board school is contrary to law.

LORD HUGH CECIL: I quite understand. At any rate, this case is of the class the hon. Member mentioned. It is a grievance not against the particular teaching a clergyman may give at a school, but it is a grievance against teachers generally, because they do not teach what the hon. Member approves. It would be a feeble remedy for the grievance merely to stop the clergy from teaching the children. It would be an impossible remedy, for you would have to go into an elaborate inquiry on controversial ground before you could determine whether in this particular school or that particular school it was improper to take the children to service. You would have to create in the Education Department a tribunal to deal with such questions. It is perfectly impossible to prevent the clergy from taking children to services of that kind. I do not know whether they do or do not. It might or might not be an offence against the ecclesiastical law, but it is not one on which the Department can intervene. We have always recognised that it is very unfair that in a large part of the country there should be only Church of England schools, and that Nonconformists should be obliged to send their children there, but the remedy is in the hands of the Nonconformist leaders. If they will agree with us that the true principle of education is that every child should be brought up in the belief of its parents, the whole question will be solved in a very short time. If the Nonconformist leaders will extend that measure of consideration they claim for themselves to the Church of England, a friendly arrangement might be come to by which the education of this country should be resettled, not on the present undenominational basis, but on a denominational basis, and then the real Nonconformist grievance would disappear. We will most gladly enter into any kind of discussion with Nonconformists with the object of meeting their views if the Nonconformists are equally ready to meet ours. We have over and over again said to Members in this House who are interested in this matter that it really rests with the Nonconformist leaders to say whether or not the religious question shall continue or be brought to a friendly settlement. We must all recognise how great an obstacle to educational progress is the fact that there are two religious bodies contending over the school children. From our point of view it is inevitable; we consider that religious education is the most important part of education, and we can never consent to sacrifice the most important to the less important part. None the less, from an educational point of view it is deplorable. I think there is nothing more absurd than to contemplate the attitude of the different religious bodies respecting educational reform; the question at the back of their minds is, "How will this affect the controversy between denominational and undenominational schools?" They remind me always of two cats, who watch one another in an attitude of constant suspicion, varied by occasional imprecation. We witnessed it this year over the block grant. I myself spent a great deal of time in considering what the effect of the block grant would be on denominational schools, and I have no doubt those interested in the opposite point of view were exercised by similar considerations. From an educational point of view that is undoubtedly ridiculous. Religious peace on the educational question can be easily brought about if Nonconformists are prepared to accept the fundamental proposition that the determination of the religious education of the child belongs to the parent.

Mr. BIRRELL (Fifeshire, W.): I am glad that the noble Lord has so clearly explained to the Committee that the great obstacle in the way of a good system of education in this country is not the attitude assumed by the parents, but the attitude assumed by religious proselytisers on both sides of the House belonging to different kinds of religion. It is a most extraordinary thing that in none of the instances of alleged grievances in regard to religious education have we heard anything of the parents. I have a curious case of that in my own constituency in Scotland. Scotland is generally supposed to be a Protestant country, but there is in my constituency in Fife a Roman Catholic school which is the only school in the district, and whither Protestant children come. I have had political meetings in the school attended by the Protestants of the district. I have often been told by religious agitators, who abound in that neighbourhood, that it is a monstrous grievance that the children of Scotch Presbyterians at the latter end of the century should be obliged to go to a Roman Catholic school within a few miles of the ancient town of Dunfermline. I have always said that I will agitate and grow excited over the matter the moment I am requested to do so by the parents of any of the children who are condemned to go to this school. I have said it in the school, and in the newspapers in the district, but from that day to this not a single complaint has ever been made to me personally or through the post by any of those parents, and I do not believe the Protestantism of that parish is less sound than that of any throughout the length and breadth of Scotland. My hon. friend the Member for Flint has spoken of the grievance of sending a child to a "Romish" school. It would be a grievance if a Protestant child—or rather a child of Protestant parents, for I do not see why we should brand a child with the religious idiosyncrasies of its parents —were sent to a school during the hours when the special doctrines of that branch of the Christian Church we call Roman are taught, but there is no allegation that that is the case. There is no allegation of proselytising being the result to children sent to these schools. I do not think any Presbyterian parent need be under any apprehension in sending his child to a school called Roman Catholic if the Conscience Clause is observed, or even if it is not. At different periods of my life it has been my lot to learn both the shorter catechism of the Church of Scotland and the catechism of the Church of England; neither I nor my parents were Presbyterians or Anglicans, yet I learnt both these catechisms without any injury whatever to my independence of mind. Of the two catechisms the document of the Church of England is the least denominational I have ever learnt. In fact this is not a question of the parents or of the children, it is a question of the agitators belonging to religious bodies, who think the children should belong to them when they grow up. A religiously-minded parent deeply holding and strongly attached to a religious opinion or an irreligious opinion can send his child with perfect safety to a Board school or to a denominational school, to whatever denomination it belongs. I can instance the case of a man for whom I have great respect, who entertains the very strongest Agnostic opinions, whose children have received at a London Board school special commendation and prizes for a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. My Agnostic friend has no objection whatever to his children being so instructed. He would, indeed, be a fool who in these days would deprive his children of the benefit of sharing a knowledge common to the rest of the human family. I think in this matter we ought to deal out to Anglicans the same measure of justice we are prepared to deal out to Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholics belong in this country to a poor class. Many of the parents lead lives in which they become indifferent Catholics, and the priests and others interested in the Roman Catholic faith feel it a duty to provide the children with schools, which are really missionary schools. A man, if he really cares for his religion, can himself instil it into the minds of his children. We are told over and over again that it is a monstrous crime that we do not provide Anglican schools, so that Anglican parents may have the pride and satisfaction of sending their children to them. But if the parents care a snap of the finger for their Anglicism they will see that their children on Sundays, and in Sunday schools, are instructed in the doctrines of Christianity. The fact is that an enormous number of parents in this country are totally indifferent to and ignore religion altogether. They may think it a good and desirable thing for other people, or say at Election time that they wish their children to receive religious education, but personally they are indifferent to it. Consequently the religious bodies are really missionary societies, and they watch each other, as the noble Lord has said, like angry animals to see that no proposal made in this House interferes with what is really a missionary enterprise—namely, teaching the children of this country distinct religious dogmas. We must make up our minds whether we wish the education of this country to be religious or non-religious, and I quite agree that the time has come when we may advantageously reconsider that question. I dislike the notion of all the schools of this country being denominational, and I hope there will always remain a large number of persons who will be satisfied with what is called Board school religion, which, as the Archbishop of Canterbury has admitted, I think cheerfully, is a very excellent form of Christianity. Though it may not be enough for some people, I should have thought in other cases it might supplement the deficiencies at home. I should, indeed, be sorry if it were thought necessary to stamp every school in the country even during one hour of the day, with distinctive religious opinions. I only rose to ask the House to bear in mind that the grievances are grievances of the religious bodies and not of the children. I think no instance has ever been brought home to my mind that the children of Nonconformists are subjected in the schools to treatment of which they need be frightened. In the training colleges, Nonconformists who wish to adopt the teaching profession undoubtedly do suffer an intolerable wrong. It may be said that the Nonconformists should establish training colleges of their own, but the fact remains that we have supported out of the public purse training colleges to which it is practically impossible for Nonconformists to obtain an entrance. They therefore are cut off from one of the grandest opportunities of doing public service that are open to the young men of the present day and of time to come. I do think the Church of England would do well, exercising the great authority and power it does in this matter, if it did all it could to extend these advantages to Nonconformists, who are every bit as pious as churchmen themselves, and who, after all, entertain and share for the most part the great bulk of their opinions, and who are well qualified to contend with the scepticism and materialism of the age, which is a far greater danger than any which has been named, if they were allowed to enter the schools. The right hon. Gentleman is very sympathetic in these matters, but somehow he does not seem able in the Department to which he belongs to give effect to the principle he puts forward. Whether there is an influence by his side which interferes with the carrying out of the excellent, magnificent, and enlightened opinions which he holds, I do not know, but I do not think that during the time he has held his present office the application of the principles he has so often expounded has been very greatly extended throughout the country.

*MR. HUDSON (Hertfordshire, Hitchin) said there was one point which had not been brought before the Committee, but upon which he had received a large number of letters from various schoolmasters throughout the country, and that was the question of the right of appeal from the decision of the managers. A good deal could be said on both sides of the question, but certainly in nearly all the States of Europe, and in all the Colonies, the masters had the right of appeal. In this country under the recent Act the teachers had to pay part of their salaries to a pension fund, the whole of which payments they lost if they were dismissed. There was no doubt that cases did occur in which masters were dismissed for insufficient cause, one instance being a case in which a master was dismissed because in the evening he managed the village library. It was but fair that there should be the right of appeal, either by a clause being inserted in the contract that all masters and managers had to sign, that masters should not be dismissed without reasonable cause being assigned; or to the Education Department itself.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I should like to add a few words in support of the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken. All over the country teachers feel the disability under which they suffer, and to which reference has been made, to be a very acute grievance. Evidence of this comes from the whole of the country, from north to south. The grievance has been felt for many years past, but it appears to the teachers to be peculiarly unjust to them since the passage of the Superannuation Act under which their incomes are affected. They are now compelled by law to pay in a portion of their salaries to provide superannuation for themselves, and it is therefore peculiarly wrong that either the school board or denominational managers should be at liberty to send them about their business without any reason being assigned, seeing that by such dismissal they lose the payments they have made. It is a very small matter that these people who do such excellent work ask at our hands. You, Sir, have told us that we can speak only of what the Department can do. I hope I may be allowed to say that when we vote money for the Department we ought to be at liberty to say what the Department ought to have power to do. It seems to me that the Department ought to have the power, and to exercise it, of insisting that every teacher should be under agreement, and whether or not the words were in the agreement they should be supposed to be there, that no teacher should be dismissed without reasonable cause assigned. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of some action which I have taken in opposition, as it happens, to the policy of the National Union of Teachers. The teachers have desired that they should be more rather than less free to inflict corporal punishment. I have had an interview with a number of teachers in my constituency, at which they laid before me their view that a diminution of their power was a derogation of the dignity of a noble profession. At the end of the interview they put before me this grievance with regard to unjust and capricious dismissal. I asked them what would be the position with regard to the question of unjust or capricious dismissal if the meeting before me had been one not of elementary school teachers, but of clergymen of the Church of England. I said that the clergymen would probably have addressed to me exactly the same argument in favour of their freedom to dismiss teachers as the teachers had used with regard to their freedom to inflict corporal punishment upon children—that the clergymen would have said that any diminution whatever of the power now in the hands of managers of schools would be a derogation of the dignity of a noble profession. To my mind it is a very strong argument, though I do not know that it is a very noble one, that those who pay the piper should call the tune. It is the nation and not the managers of the school who pay the teachers, and therefore it is right that there should be an appeal granted to the teachers against any dismissal which they consider to be unjust or capricious.

*MR. TALBOT was understood to express a desire to correct a misstatement of the hon. Member for Flintshire with regard to training colleges. He was not going to enter into the question of the teaching given in the colleges. The colleges formed an important part of the educational equipment of the country, were directly under the control of the Vice-President of the Council, and therefore came under discussion in connection with the Vote then being considered. The grievance alleged by the hon. Member for Flintshire was that the training colleges were almost exclusively in the hands of the Church of England, and that therefore Nonconformists had cause of complaint. But if Nonconformists considered they had a grievance in that matter the remedy was entirely in their own hands. The Church of England training colleges, to which it was said Nonconformists had no access, were founded by members of the Church of England, assisted, no doubt, by the State. There were plenty of wealthy Nonconformists, and why did not they come forward and establish Nonconformist training colleges? Any sort of training college could be built——

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: But will they get a building grant?

*MR. TALBOT: Certainly not; nor could the Church get a building grant.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: They could not now.

*MR. TALBOT was sorry that the conscience of the hon. Baronet had awoke too late; he should have built his training colleges a few years ago. At the present moment Nonconformists could build training colleges on exactly the same footing as members of the Church of England, and no doubt the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President would give them every encouragement, while certainly the Church of England had no desire in any respect whatever to hinder the formation of such colleges founded by Nonconformists or anyone else. The Committee had been told that the supply of teachers was lamentably short. Here, then, was a grand opportunity, if there was a real want of teachers throughout the country, for Nonconformists to put their hands into their pockets and provide more accommodation; but until Nonconformists showed their confidence in their own principles by establishing training colleges they could not expect much weight to attach to their complaints.

MR. STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): The subject which I wish to bring before the Committee is one that appeals to Members in a way very different from the important question which has just been somewhat desultorily discussed. I wish to bring before the notice of the Committee and of the Vice-President an omission from the purview of the Education Department in which I feel an interest is taken on both sides of the House; I refer to the poor law schools.

The points I wish to raise are extremely definite and practical, and I will detain the Committee very shortly in dealing with them. The Committee is perhaps not wholly aware that a very large number of the children of this country who are receiving elementary education are not under the control in any form of the Education Department in respect of that education. The children to whom I refer are the pauper children who do not attend ordinary public elementary schools in the district. There are here and there instances in which the children in the workhouses may be sent to public elementary schools in the neighbourhood, but those cases are very few, and owing to the necessities and the circumstances of the case that system cannot be very generally adopted. I do not refer to cases of boarded out children—they may no doubt attend ordinary public elementary schools—I refer generally to the great mass of the children of paupers who come under the influence of the poor law in this country. These children have an entirely separate system of education. They are educated by teachers who do not intermingle with, and who are really practically ineligible for, ordinary elementary school work. The teachers in poor law schools are a class apart; they are not submitted to the training which other teachers have to undergo, and the experience they gain does not fit them to be teachers generally for the Department. Some amelioration was made in this matter after I brought the question before the House a number of years ago, but that amelioration has been very small, and has had little practical effect. These teachers are not under the Education Department similarly to other teachers. In the next place, the education of the children is under the inspection not of the ordinary educational inspectors, but of inspectors of the Local Government Board. The result of these two facts is that the education given to our pauper children is given by inferior teachers, is of an inferior nature, and is wholly out of touch with the general education of the elementary schools of the country. I can appeal to Members on both sides of the House who have taken part in the work of the guardians to corroborate what I say as to the distinctly inferior nature of the education. Who need better teachers and better education so much as the pauper children? Such children would be described in the ordinary educational system of the country as peculiarly difficult children to deal with, and therefore as requiring a peculiarly good class of teachers. Under these circumstances there is another difficulty which arises. Our pauper children are not always in the workhouses. Their fathers and mothers may become paupers and then go out again, so that for a certain period of their lives the children are under the ordinary educational system of the country, and for another period they are under a totally different system—namely, the pauper children's educational system. The result is that they are very greatly thrown back in their education by the transfer from the one system to the other; their education is greatly hindered by the fact that when they pass from the one system to the other they do not fit in to the system to which they go in consequence of having been prepared in the system from which they come. What I am bringing forward is no theoretical difficulty. A number of boards of guardians have brought this question before the House and the Department from time to time in various ways. It was first brought before me by the board of guardians for the parish a part of which I represent in this House, and twelve years ago I brought the matter before the House in the following way. The Shoreditch Board of Guardians, being very anxious to take the children out of the influence of the workhouse, set up a school with a number of boarding houses in a country district a few miles out of London—Hornchurch, and there they carried on a system of education of as high a type as they could. Their difficulties have been just those difficulties which I have endeavoured to lay before the Committee, and they have urged the Department to take the education in the schools from under the inspection of the Local Government Board and to place it under the ordinary education inspectors. Other districts in London have felt the same difficulty, and have made the same request. Their desire has been to secure a better education for the children under their control. Of late others outside London have made the same request. The guardians of Birmingham are now bringing the matter before the Local Government Board or the Education Department, or both, and are making the same request. When I first brought the matter forward the Education Department was very anxious and willing to undertake the inspection of the education of these children, but the Local Government Board was at that time very much against the transfer. That was the block against any further proceeding at that time. But a few years ago when I again approached the Local Government Board, I found, to my gratification, that the Board, as represented by its present head and Parliamentary Secretary and officials generally, was strongly in favour of the change. Then I thought the case was gained. But when I approached the Education Department I found it had changed its mind, and instead of being in favour of, it was against the change. It is because the Education Department is now the unwilling Department that I bring this matter forward on this Vote. What was the answer when I brought this matter forward in 1897? What was the answer we received when a deputation waited on the right hon. Gentleman? The answer seems to have been of a very inadequate nature. First of all, the right hon. Gentleman said the education to be inspected was a very small portion of the real education of the children, that the real education consisted of the whole influences that are brought to bear upon them in their day to day work, etc., etc. But that argument equally applies to the whole work of the Education Department. The Education Department has to inspect and to certify, to deal with and to control, that portion of education in its widest sense which is comprehended in school work and dealt with by the school inspector. Beyond that, we are all well aware that the real education of the child, whether in the workhouse or at home, depends on many influences which go far beyond what the Board of Education can touch. As I understand, the right hon. Gentleman does not want to take over the inspection of the education of these children unless he has handed over to the Education Department the whole control of the every-day life of these children—of their food, clothing, habitation, and everything else. That may or may not be a very good thing, but it is a counsel of perfection surely, even from the point of view of those who desire it. I do not desire it. I frankly say that I do not think the Education Department of this country is a fit and proper body to take over the whole every-day life of the pauper children; I think that work is best left to the guardians, who are daily becoming more and more enlightened as to their duties. We need not, however, enter into that dispute, because even to those thoroughly in favour of that point of view it is a counsel of perfection, and would require a series of Bills or legislative measures which I do not think at the present moment or for many years to come any Government is likely to undertake. Under these circumstances I ask, why do you allow your schools to be such an enemy of good? Why do you refuse to take this one step because you wish at some future indefinite time to take some much larger step? So much for that particular argument. Another argument which the right hon. Gentleman used in his reply to us was that there was no means of enforcing the Report of the Department upon the guardians. The boards of guardians who desire to have their schools placed under the Education Department for the examination of teachers and the like are perfectly willing to have their grant depending, as any other school, upon the Report of the Local Government Board. It is perfectly clear, from the Report of the Education Department, that this is a mere matter of departmental arrangement. There are difficulties in it, but if the heads of the two Departments will put their heads together they can arrange that the boards of guardians shall be dealt with like any other school managers would be if they did not submit and fall in with the requirements of the Education Department. These are the main arguments, and I have tried to put the case as shortly as possible, so as not to delay the Committee upon this matter. I submit that our pauper children would receive a far better education if they were placed for the examination of their education and for their teachers' certificates under the Education Department than they can have if left under the Local Government Board. The Local Government Board is essentially not an educational body. The Board of Education has its experts, and it has devoted twenty-five years or more to the consideration of all educational problems. It has at its head a most thorough educationist in whom we feel great confidence. Why should we cut off our pauper children from all these good influences because of some theory of perfection which the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President of the Council seems to hold? I really think that the pressure and representations now made might at any rate lead the right hon. Gentleman to seriously reconsider this matter, for I feel confident that the minor details of the arrangements between the two Departments could be got over. I would like to make one suggestion. There are in this country something like 600 unions, and they have each got their own pauper children. It may be felt by both Departments—and I think I have the President of the Local Government Board with me in this—that a clean sweep to turn, willy-nilly, the whole of these pauper schools under the Education Department might be too sweeping a step. If that be so, then let us take those of the most important boards of guardians in the country who are now begging to have their schools transferred to the Education Department. Let us take them seriatim and try the experiment upon those who are willing. I do not say that that is exactly what I desire should be done, for I should like to see it done altogether; but if there be a difficulty in doing it altogether, here you have certain boards of guardians begging and anxious to be willing helpers in carrying out any new arrangement, and why not do it in respect to them? In 1863 and up till then the education of pauper children was under the Education Department, and not under the Local Government Board, but it was transferred from the Education Department to the Local Government Board because of departmental difficulties.

Sir J. GORST: Exactly.

Mr. STUART: My right hon. friend agrees, and he thinks he makes a point out of it. Now I am going to make a point the other way. In 1863 you had boards of guardians dealing with the education of pauper children who were desirous of doing as little as they could for the education of those children. Now you have quite a different state of things, for the boards of guardians you can try the experiment with are extremely anxious to do their best, and I think the right hon. Gentleman opposite and the President of the Local Government Board will admit that certain boards of guardians for whom I am pleading are doing everything in their power to improve the education of their children. They are labouring hard to bring about this result, and the reason they are coming forward asking for this transfer is to make them able to do their work more effectively. This is not a pecuniary question with the boards of guardians. Of course the guardians now get a grant for these pauper children from the Local Government Board, but if the transfer took place they would then get a grant upon the Report of the inspector of the Education Department. I have looked into this matter in some of our most important poor law schools, and if you work out what they get now under the present system you will find that it is within a few pounds of what they would get under the block system. If it is anything it is a slight loss to the board of guardians to make the change to the Education Department. This is not worth counting, for their object is not to get a double grant, but to place their schools upon the basis under which they will be subject to reward and punishment, and under which they will secure an education for the children which they cannot secure now. Their whole object is to improve the education of pauper children, not to keep it back. I hope I have put this question without going beyond what is in order, and I do not wish to criticise the way in which the Local Government Board carries on this work. The Local Government Board does the best it can under difficult circumstances, but what I criticise is that the right hon. Gentleman and the Board of Education are not meeting the Local Government Board by effecting a transfer, which I think is desirable in the best interests of a class of children in this country who need good education more than any other class.

*Mr. DAVID MacIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale): No one can appreciate more than I do the services of the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President of the Council, not only upon educational matters, but also throughout his whole public career. There is no one who more thoroughly agrees than I do with the admirable and interesting statement which the right hon. Gentleman has made to-night. But the immediate subject which I wish to bring before the Committee is not so much my right hon. friend's personal views as the administration of his Department and the effect which the new code is likely to have upon the great community of Liverpool. Upon this occasion I speak not only for my own constituency, but in reality for the whole of Liverpool. I feel that I owe an apology to the senior Member for Liverpool (Mr. Lawrence), who, on a recent occasion when a similar subject was under consideration, spoke with great authority for the people of Liverpool; and whom I do not wish to supplant. But I have been more recently in Liverpool, and only yesterday I had the case put before me very clearly by the Secretary of the Liverpool School Board. There is no difference of opinion there upon this question. I have also a further justification for venturing to speak on this subject, because some of the schools which are most hardly hit in Liverpool by what the Education Department propose to do are in my own constituency, and because the chairman of the Liverpool School Board happens to be a valued constituent of mine, and a gentleman who through long years, and with but scant remuneration and scant consideration for the excellent work he has done, has devoted his energies and abilities to the cause of religious teaching in Liverpool. I want to give the Committee the most recent statement which has been made with authority in Liverpool, and I will take the speech made by Colonel Morrison, who is a very well known and much respected Liverpool man, and who happens to be the vice-chairman of the Liverpool School Board. I will give a sentence or two from that speech, and I will quote just enough to show that we are not antagonistic, but that we appreciate and value the new Code and what it does, and we also value and appreciate the Minute of the Education Department, although we think that that Minute requires some alteration and amendment to meet the case of Liverpool and other communities in a similar position. Colonel Morrison said—

"The new Code was not so much a modification of what had gone before as it was a reformation, or even a revolution. No such far-reaching change had come over the spirit of the educational dream since the great Act of 1870. The vicious principle of payment by results was now gone, and they were introduced to a totally new atmosphere and completely different circumstances."

I will not trouble the Committee by any lengthy reading of extracts, but I do wish to show that we have the authority of Colonel Morrison, speaking for his colleagues, upon this question. He points out—

"Under these heads Liverpool Board schools would lose £1,020 per annum, and the losses to Voluntary schools would be severe. Many single schools in this diocese would lose £50, £60, and more per annum according to circumstances. Whilst this new Code undoubtedly did an immense amount of good by levelling up, it also levelled down and crippled numerous schools which had hitherto done good work."

Colonel Morrison went on to say—

"The Liverpool School Board had done their best to persuade the Board of Education to recognise higher classes in existing schools for the purpose of the Minute, and to give their grants for higher teaching in the higher classes providing the classes were reasonably organised to meet the necessary requirements of the Minute. So far, however, the Board had failed in its endeavours. He was convinced in his mind, and all the Liverpool Board were firmly convinced that this separate teaching in separate departments was educationally the greatest possible mistake. They have never followed it in the Liverpool Board; they had always gone exactly on the opposite principle, and he believed they were doing the very best for the education of the children."

I wanted to refer to the Church schools, but perhaps it is best that I should refer to the Wesleyan body, which at this moment would, I think, be especially appropriate. The Senior Wrangler of the year had his early training in a Wesleyan Voluntary school, and I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. P. H. Ingram, the principal of that school, a portion of which I will venture to quote to the House. He says—

"The Code as at present existing will have the tendency to level up poor schools and level down the better class schools, producing an average which is far below what is possible and what ought to and could be attained were all schools to be placed upon a thoroughly sound financial basis. The results of the new Minute cannot but tend to a lowering of the general standard of education throughout the country."

For one moment I will quote a sentence or two from what Canon T. Major Lester, the chairman of the Liverpool School Board, says in reference to his own schools. He says—

"This subject is becoming more grave and imperative as day after day passes on. We must lose on our two schools £70 yearly. The maximum should be 26s., and that amount would prevent extravagance and yet keep up schools. If so, we were blighted. If the Minute passes as it is, and our Voluntary schools are not allowed to compete for higher education, and must have two masters, and children leave us at the fourth standard, then we shall be wiped off and die out one by one."

The Liverpool School Board as a whole hold such views. The National Association of Voluntary Schools hold views which are practically the same as those of the Liverpool School Board. They consist of members of the Church of England, Wesleyans, Nonconformists, and Roman Catholics—all earnest and good men, and all desirous of doing the best they can for the cause of education. I will also refer for a moment to what I saw in to-day's local newspaper in a report of the annual meeting of the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church, which was held yesterday, and I want to emphasise a paragraph in the report of that society which harmonises absolutely with the views of the Liverpool School Board. This report says—

"The new Code of 1900 was, on the whole, welcomed by the Committee. The Block Grants were looked upon as a great step in the right direction, but the Committee hoped that the Board of Education would so carry into execution the recent Minute on higher elementary schools as to secure higher grade Voluntary schools from loss."

I do not wish to weary the Committee by speaking at any length, but since I came into the House I have received a letter from the secretary to the school board, and there are one or two paragraphs in that letter to which I ought at least to refer. He says, with reference to the Code and the Minute—

"To neither are they opposed in principle; but to the details of both they take serious exception, as calculated to injure rather than to benefit education as a whole. The evil, as you know, is confined to the better schools, and arises from the withdrawal of the Specific Subjects Grant. That grant amounts to only a little more than £36,000; but the whole loss falls on some 3,000 departments out of over 30,000. The loss averages about £12 per Department, but in many individual schools in Liverpool and other large towns it reaches from £40 to £80."

He goes on to say—

"Is it worth while for so paltry a saving to discourage so seriously as they are doing all the most enterprising schools of the country?"

There is another passage which it is my duty to point out to the Committee. The Vice-President of the Council made a calculation of the number of children affected by the withdrawal of the Specific Subjects Grant, and he made it out to be something very small indeed. I think he said it was something like 6 per cent. of the whole; but, as the secretary of the Liverpool School Board puts it, there is a fallacy which underlies that. He says—

"It is not only those who are now receiving such instruction that are affected by the matter. Those also are similarly interested, who, in the ordinary course, would in due time enter upon such instruction. Thus at least 1,260 children must be added to the 346,000 to find what proportion of the whole are affected, raising the total now interested to over 30 per cent."

They recommend that the following be added as an additional clause to the Minute—

"The Board of Education may apply the general terms of this Minute to the upper classes of any public elementary school which the Board is satisfied complies with the conditions of the Minute with regard to equipment, and to strength and quality of staff."

I have now almost finished, and I have to thank the Committee for so kindly listening to me. I have endeavoured as best I could to put before the Committee views which, although they are my own, have far greater authority behind them than if they were simply my own. The Liverpool School Board, as is perfectly well known, has always enjoyed the confidence of the whole district, and there are on the Liverpool School Board men of different religious views, all of whom are anxious to do their best for the cause of education. I do think that I have made out some sort of a case showing that one cast-iron rule ought not to be applied to rural and town districts. The circumstances vary. Liverpool is no inconsiderable place. Hon. Members have spoken of Wales, but what is the population of the Principality of Wales as compared with that of Liverpool? The population of Liverpool is more than half the entire population of Wales, and in Liverpool there is no doubt or hesitation whatever about this as to what is wanted. They approve generally of the New Code, but they say that the regulations as they understand them are going to work disadvantageously for the best class of schools in Liverpool, and they ask my right hon. friend and the Education Department to give their case reasonable and fair consideration, and to interpret their Minute in such a way as will help the Liverpool schools to maintain their position. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman has no desire to do any real injury to those excellent Voluntary schools.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): The hon. Member opposite has made a strong attack upon the age at which children should go to school. Recently we have had largely to increase the number of our infant schools because hitherto we did not expect to have to find accommodation for children under five years of age, whereas it has been found that the working classess send their children to school as soon as they are three. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that it was not necessary to have any education for children below the age of five, and that under that age they ought to be running about the lanes all day. That might be all very well for a healthy boy of twelve, but children of six years and three years cannot run about the lanes all day, and they require some place for rest. There is a nursery made for them. In crowded centres their mothers have no time to attend to them, and there is no room in which they can be conveniently kept during the day time; therefore, to be able to send these young children to school is a very great boon to the working classes. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that there were some infant schools in which the infants were not altogether treated kindly. I do not know what is the rule of the Education Department with regard to the cane, but I certainly think it ought to be prohibited in infant schools, and I would think very little of the school manager who permitted it. I am happy to say that my experience has not been that of the right hon. Gentleman I have seen nothing but kindness in infant schools. I believe it is now a rule of the Education Department that infants are not to be kept sitting still, but that they are, at the end of every twenty minutes or so, to be allowed to run around the room. The seats, too, are much more comfortable, and the infants' legs do not dangle down as in the old days. There is no light thrown on their eyes, and the schools are kept warm and well ventilated. My experience is that these little children are very fond indeed of school. The right hon. Gentleman told us of an infant school in which a half-witted girl was made a monitress in order to amuse the smaller babies, while the school mistress taught the older infants. It is very easy to raise a laugh in this House, but if we look at it from a common-sense point of view that was a very sensible arrangement. We all agree that babies of that age do not want teaching, and the right hon. Gentleman says that this half-witted girl was very kind to the infants, being no doubt actuated by that love of children generally inherent in half-witted people. It seems to me that it was a very sensible arrangement that this girl should have been allowed to keep quiet the very little children. I have seen so much of infant schools, especially in rural parishes, that I earnestly trust the right hon. Gentleman, notwithstanding the opinion enunciated this evening, will not make any alteration with regard to them.

MR. FLOWER (Bradford, W.): I desire to allude to the question of the tenure of teachers. It is a matter which arouses a very great deal of interest throughout the whole of the teaching profession, and which concerns teachers in Voluntary schools as well as teachers in Board schools. It is of course a matter which affects teachers employed under microscopical school boards rather than teachers employed in large school boards where the search-light of public opinion is promptly brought to bear on all cases of injustice or tyranny. However, this is a question on which all teachers are practically united, and it is one of very great importance to education, because on the quality of our teachers really depends our progress in educational matters. The fact that we have been fortunate enough in this Parliament to pass a teachers' pension scheme has given the question of tenure even more importance than it had before. It may now be said that we nurse teachers from the time of their apprenticeship up to the time of their certification. They are examined several times with regard to their physical health as well as to their intellectual capacity and personal character, but once they are certified they never know whether they will be continued in their employment for a sufficient period of time to entitle them to pensions, although they are compelled to keep up their pension payments. We differ in this respect from every other country in Europe, and I certainly hope that the right hon. Gentleman, who has always been a sympathetic friend to the teaching profession, will recognise the importance of dealing with this matter. It can be dealt with, I believe, by an article in the Code, and, if not, there will be no difficulty in passing legislation for the purpose during the present session. The only other matter to which I should like to direct the attention of the Committee is that of the poor law schools referred to by the hon. Gentleman for Hoxton Division. No one acquainted with the Report of the Committee which was issued in 1895 can fail to recognise the fact that children brought up in poor law schools suffer both in quantity and quality as regards the education which they receive. The whole Report, to which I believe the right hon. Gentleman was a signatory, is a condemnation of poor law schools. I frankly agree with the hon. Member for the Hoxton Division that if these schools are to exist at all it would be better that they should be under the inspection of the Education Department, but my point rather is that these schools ought not to exist at all. Guardians are, I believe, getting more enlightened, and if they chose to treat children in the proper way there would be no need to send them to the workhouses at all, and they would be freed from that taint which is always associated with the workhouse, and which will always attach to these poor law schools however much you improve the character of the education given in them. If a system of boarding out were adopted the children could attend the ordinary schools, and would be merged in the general child life of the country. Until that can be done I confess I think the Education Department would do well to take over the inspection of poor law schools. Their inspector's report would not, I think, be ignored by any board of guardians, and even if it were ignored, public opinion would be brought to bear on the more glaring defects and they would be remedied. I hope on both these matters we shall have a sympathetic assurance from the right hon. Gentleman.

*Mr. MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale): The right hon. Gentleman has made a speech to-day which on the whole is very satisfactory to hon. Members on this side of the House, and the views he expressed are very much in sympathy with the views which we entertain also. His speech did not differ from others which I have read in former years, proving that the view he takes of national education is much broader and more liberal than the view generally held by the Government. With regard to the many subjects he brought forward very little difference of opinion can exist; but there is one omission to which I should like to direct the right hon. Gentleman's attention, and that is that no reference has been made by him to the state of things produced by the Minute which was discussed a few weeks ago. By that Minute the higher grade schools are placed, as the right hon. Gentleman knows, in a very uncertain position. They are no longer to be supported by special grants, which have been their chief means of subsistence. We are left in doubt as to how long higher elementary education is to be left in this suspended condition—partly in the air and partly on the ground. If this Minute is to be of any value—if it is to confer benefit on these higher grade schools—it would be well if it were carried out quickly. At the present time technical schools are practically empty during the day, though they provide, of course, excellent instruction in the evenings. If we were to provide a two years course for boys of fourteen years of age, coming from higher elementary schools, in the ordinary technical schools of the country in the daytime, we should fit them at sixteen years of age to become far more efficient apprentices in all the more scientific industries of the country, and also more fitted to engage in other walks of life, and in a few years we should have a totally different population. I am intimately acquainted with the systems prevailing in Germany, Switzerland, America, and elsewhere; and as one largely interested in the scientific industries of England, I feel we are suffering immensely for want of well-educated boys to come as apprentices or to take responsible posts, whereas in other countries there are hundreds of young fellows available for all the workshops, and after a few years in the shops they are placed in positions of responsibility. I am not speaking now of the higher technical schools, but of schools such as we have in Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, and elsewhere, and if we could throw them open during the day to scholars from the higher elementary schools, I am quite sure that the parents would only be too glad to send them, in order that they might be better prepared for the positions they are to occupy in after life. I regret, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman did not allude to the higher grade schools which he said on a previous occasion the Department intended to establish. I think it is a matter of very great importance, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be good enough to inform the Committee what provision the Board of Education has made, or is about to make, to encourage the school boards and managers of Voluntary schools to establish higher grade departments in connection with their schools. I presume that the Education Department has considered the question as to how these higher grade departments are going to be established. I hope this is not one of the excellent "intentions" of the Education Department. We have heard a great many of them since the right hon. Gentleman has practically presided over the education of this country. I have the most perfect confidence in the right hon. Gentleman's intentions, but there appears to be some obstruction always in his way. He does not disclose all the facts to us, but his speeches indicate that there is always some lion in the path, or someone who throws cold water on all his excellent intentions. I trust the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give us some encouragement that the Board schools and also the Voluntary schools are to have facilities offered to them to start these higher grade departments. It would be a very cheerful announcement to the country, and we would all do what we could to assist the right hon. Gentleman to carry forward his good intentions. I should also like to allude to another omission in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He criticised the infant schools, but did not say how he would improve them. I differ entirely from the right hon. Gentleman with regard to infant teaching. My experience of infant teaching is based entirely on a system which I have almost all my life endeavoured to encourage—namely, the kindergarten system, carried out especially for the children of the working classes. The right hon. Gentleman gave an example of the kind of teaching to be found in infant schools; I should like to give another example, which, if he would do me the honour to consider it, might perhaps help the Department in making infant school teaching one of the most important factors, if not the main foundation of education in this country.

SIR J. GORST: At what age would you begin?

*MR. MATHER: At three years of age. In the town of Salford I erected an infant school for 400 "gutter" children who were trained on that system. They entered the school at three years of age, and proceeded to the Board school at six or seven. Not only were the habits of the children improved, but the habits of the parents were also improved through the influence of the children. So much was that the case in Salford that it was quite an interesting sight to all interested in education to visit the school to which I have referred. The teaching requires to be totally different from that given at the age of seven. Children at the age of three are in the most impressionable period of their lives. If they are allowed to ramble about the streets from their wretched homes they become vitiated without any criminal intent, and become imbued with ideas and habits that the elementary schools cannot remove. That is a very important part of the explanation as to why, after thirty years of excellent elementary teaching, so very few of the children of the working classes in after life do justice to the training and education they received at school. I believe it is because that from three to six—the most important part of child life—they are allowed to run around the streets and pick up habits and ideas which they never got rid of. The impressions which children receive during that period remain with them throughout their lives. Of course it is not attempted to teach such children their letters or to deal with them in any way on the lines of ordinary elementary education. That would be absurd and would merely damage the children, and make them mere machines. If the right hon. Gentleman would only go a short distance from this House, I could show him a kindergarten school where the children enter at three and remain until they are six or seven. He will find it a perfect paradise, and the children's lives are so happy that they would rather be there than anywhere else. Such was the effect produced by the Salford school to which I have referred, that the little ones came on Sundays, on holidays, and on Saturday afternoons, and knocked at the doors to be admitted into the school so that they might have the enjoyment which they could not get elsewhere. The whole neighbourhood, in fact, was changed by that school, and the homes were vastly improved by the better habits the children brought into them. At the first start of the school the mothers would threaten "to do for" the school mistress if she attempted to touch her children if they needed to be washed; but after a time not only did the children come to school clean themselves, but the mothers came with them clean also. Infant teaching may be carried out in a manner which is a blessing to the children and prepares them for the teaching in elementary schools and for after-life. I would only mention one other matter. It appears to me that teachers throughout the country generally who subscribe to the pension-fund require greater consideration than they now receive at the hands of the Education Department as regards summary dismissal. That is a matter which cannot be dealt with legally by the Department, but I think there is a moral obligation on the Board of Education, and I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether it would not be possible that the unreasonable complaints and the summary dismissals from which teachers suffer might not be dealt with through the Department. I trust the right hon. Gentleman may be able to give us some further information with regard to these points. I can assure him that I have the highest regard for the excellence of his motives and for the good work which has been accomplished by the Department during the period it has been under his control.

SIR R. C. JEBB (Cambridge University): I desire to refer to the Minute of the Board of Education of April 6th, proposing to establish new higher elementary schools. That Minute, it will be remembered, fixed the age limit for higher elementary schools at fifteen, and it has come to my knowledge that some very able schoolmasters contend that their views in regard to the age limit have been incorrectly recommended to this House, and that I am the person responsible. I think I can clear up the point in a very few words. The document, generally known as the Joint Memorandum, was drawn up in 1897 as the outcome of a conference between associations which represented the head masters of the secondary schools and of the higher-grade schools respectively. That Joint Memorandum nowhere explicitly defined the age limit which the signatories thought desirable for higher primary schools, but there is one passage in it from which the age contemplated by the signatories might be inferred. That passage states that the higher primary schools ought to include pupils who had taken a three or four years course after having passed the sixth standard. Boys usually pass the sixth standard about the age of twelve or thirteen, and therefore four years after that would bring up the age to sixteen or seventeen for the higher primary schools. I was quite aware of that when I referred in a recent discussion to the Joint Memorandum.* I referred to it only for the purpose of bringing out those principles for the delimitation of primary from secondary education, which the Joint Memorandum embodies, and in regard to which it is a most important document, as being the first attempt at a concordat between the masters of primary and secondary schools. But one or two of those who signed the Joint Memorandum complained that I had represented them as thinking that the recognised limit for the higher primary schools should be fifteen. Looking at the official report of what I said in *Hansard*, I cannot find that I said anything which justified any such misapprehension. Since I have been assured that my remarks could be so interpreted, and have been so interpreted, in the country, I think it is only just and right to these gentlemen to say publicly to the Committee that I did not intend to claim these gentlemen as supporting the age limit of fifteen for the higher primary schools. Their view is that in the higher primary schools education should go on to the age of sixteen or seventeen. I thank the Committee for having permitted me to make this statement, and I will only add that in the passage which they complained of, I used the phrase "higher elementary schools," which is the phrase of the Minute, and not "higher primary schools," which is the phrase employed

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxii., page 600.

throughout the Joint Memorandum. The eminent services of these gentlemen to education in their own sphere entitle them to this clear and emphatic statement upon my part.

*SIR F. S. POWELL: I hope I am not violating the rules of the House if I express great regret that so large an amount, upwards of £11,000,000, should be included in the same Vote. It is a matter deserving of comment that so large a sum, dealing with such a miscellaneous body of subjects, should be included in the same Vote. I do not think it necessary to allude to the speech made by the hon. Member for Flint at an earlier period of our proceedings to-night; but as I am a member of the committee of the National Society, I feel bound to say a word on behalf of the secretary, the Reverend Mr. Brownrigg, who is not able to speak for himself. The hon. Gentleman described the rev. gentleman as belonging to an extreme party in the Church; that accusation is entirely unfounded. I have had the privilege of the acquaintance of Mr. Brownrigg for many years in connection with the Society, and I confess that I do not know at this moment to what school of thought he belongs. He is a loyal Churchman, entirely unattached to any section into which the Church at present is most unhappily divided. As a poor law guardian, I think the remedy for the disease of pauper children is to send them to the elementary schools. In Bradford we send all our pauper children, clad in ordinary attire, to the elementary schools, where they mingle with the other children and behave and acquit themselves in a very satisfactory manner. There is in my opinion no other solution for dealing with pauper children. You must separate them from the workhouse altogether, and hand them over to proper foster-mothers, and send them to the elementary schools of the country. Until that is done the pauper taint will continue, and all your labour will be in vain. With reference to the new minute in regard to which some discussion has arisen, I would like to make one remark. I refer to one article which deals with elementary schools which requires an attendance of two years at an elementary school before the pupil is entitled to attend the higher elementary schools. In Bradford we have a school, the children of which are in great difficulty. The school conducted by the college is broken up, the college having been transferred to the technical instruction committee of the City Council; and the children are not eligible for the higher elementary school under the Act because of the two years limit. I am told by those who manage our technical college at Bradford that these children suffer great hardship in consequence of the injustice of the new Code, and I am also told that there are Germans and others who do not know our language who have lately come to London who are morally entitled to these advantages. What experience may show generally as to the operation of that clause I do not venture to say, but I think the remarks I have made show that great care must be taken, and possibly some changes made in future years. Some questions were put earlier in the evening by the hon. Member for East Somerset, and the debate on this question has drifted, as unhappily it usually does, into a denominational question and a religious controversy. But I hope my right hon. friend will not omit to give a full reply to the hon. Member for East Somerset, as I am as anxious as he is to know what is the operation at the present time of Clause 7 of the Directory. I believe the right hon. Gentleman has taken great interest in the working of the clause, and I hope he will inform us in the course of this debate what districts are within the operation of this clause, and what prospect there is of a larger number of districts being so affected. I will not deal with the transfer from the Charity Commissioners to the Education Department, as in my judgment the minute is meagre and ambiguous. The friends of education do not feel certain to which Department application should be made in any given case. This is not a matter of secondary importance, it is one which deals with great institutions and has important relation to the future progress of education in this country. Until we are better informed on this subject those who have to conduct the operations of grammar schools and secondary education will feel under great difficulty. The present condition of affairs is a great impediment to education and progress. The hon. Member for East Somerset asked, and I desire also to know, what the decision of the Government is as regards the division in the new Board of Education between secondary and technical education—or rather between elementary education on the one hand and technical and secondary education on the other. Are secondary and technical education to be treated separately under two secretaries—one to conduct the technical and one the secondary department? I wish to express my great regret, as a member of the Council of the Victoria University and member of the Council of the Yorkshire College of Leeds, that larger grants are not made to our modern universities. The Victoria University, which deals with all England, but more strictly with Lancashire and Yorkshire, has a grant of £2,000 a year; the University of Wales has a grant of £4,000, double that which the Victoria University commands. I do not wish to diminish the grant for Wales, but to most emphatically and respectfully put in a claim on behalf of the Victoria University. The same remark applies to university colleges.

*The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. Member that the motion now before the Committee is to reduce the Vice-President's salary. The hon. Member cannot discuss other subjects under this particular motion now.

*Sir F. S. POWELL: I should wish to make some further remarks, but I am afraid I should be out of order if I proceeded. I must, however, express great satisfaction at the course of the debate to-night. I think it shows that the sympathy of the Committee is with the educational reforms which have taken place, and that we desire to see greater reforms, to which these are only preliminary. I hope the anticipations of the sanguine will be fully fulfilled, and that those who are called upon to take part in these debates in years to come will look back to this present day as the dawn of a better era of education.

*Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): We have listened to the speech of the Vice-President, which was of a most astonishing character, a speech not of a Minister, but of a Front Opposition Bench critic. We are accustomed here to Ministers contenting themselves with defending the maladministration of which they have been guilty. The right hon. Gentleman who sits in the seat of authority, who is responsible to this House for the administration of the Board of Education, has not coupled with his statements of what ought to be done, anything like a plain intimation that he will endeavour to carry out the suggestions he put forward. I regret that we have received from him no hint of that kind, because some of his suggestions are easy of accomplishment. We had from him a speech full of paradox and full of extreme instances, and I think the average teachers have a right to complain of some of the instances given. The Committee is told that infant schools of this country are conducted by trained persons guilty of ignorance and want of refinement and want of qualifications, and it is unfair that instances of the ignorance of Article 68 teachers should be quoted as typical even in extreme cases of these admirable women who conduct our infant schools in this country. The right hon. Gentleman complained that some of the school boards continued the bad old system of individual examination which the Department had abolished so far as it could. But I feel that in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman there is nothing in the shape of a hint that he intends to prohibit this bad old system from continuing, though he knows very well that he can do so by a stroke of the pen. The right hon. Gentleman complains that school boards and voluntary organizations are still proceeding on these old and antiquated lines; but why does he not stop it? It is only one of the cases of disparity between the ideals and the administration of which his speech is full. The right hon. Gentleman urges the necessity of encouraging day training colleges; but why does he not go on to say that he will try to induce the Treasury to provide the £10,000 per annum necessary to place them, in respect of grant, upon an equality of footing with the residential training colleges? With regard to the reform of inspection, a step forward was taken during the vice-presidency of Mr. Mundella, when the lower-grade inspectors were translated into sub-inspectors, and another step in the direction of reform was taken in the days of Mr. Acland, when one or two of them were made inspectors of schools, but since then the process has been arrested. One could perhaps put up with that, because it was what the schools had been accustomed to. But there was an ominous foreshadow in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman to-night as to the appointment of sub-inspectors in future. We were told that in the old days when payment by results was in vogue it was necessary to have sub-inspectors, who had been teachers, but now the sub-inspectors might be men not qualified by experience in the schools to do that kind of work. I certainly formed the impression that it was the intention of the Board of Education in future to cease to appoint as sub-inspectors men who have been teachers in schools, and to appoint young men on the list of a University Employment Agency who have no experience in schools at all. I wish to point out that no matter how learned academically, how earnest and sympathetic, and how high his ideals in regard to education the inspector you send into the public elementary schools, if he himself has had no experience in a public elementary school, or of elementary school children, and does not know the limitations of their environment, or their ability, will pitch the key too high, and he will become unsympathetic, contemptuous, and perfunctory, except in very rare instances indeed. At present, if it were not for the sub-inspectors, who know from long experience what can be done in a school, and how far the limitations do apply and hamper, the inspection of the schools of the country would be carried out in a very imperfect fashion indeed. The lack of friction is often due to the fact that the inspectors who are sent to do the work without previous experience at all rely on the experience of subordinates — the sub-inspectors who have been teachers—and so difficulty is avoided. I would warn the Committee, and particularly the Vice-President of the Council, against any idea of stopping the appointment in future, to the lower grades of inspectorate at any rate, of men who by experience know something about the work and the limitations incidental to public elementary schools. I have met inspectors who have risen from the ranks of teachers in France, Switzerland, and Germany, and I venture to state that inspectors so chosen will compare favourably in every respect with the inspectors of this country. Another important subject is the relationship between the school managers and the teachers. Remarks have been made in this debate about the dismissal of teachers by the managers. That is an obvious difficulty, and I do not mean to dwell upon it. It might destroy a teacher's income for months or years. It might blacken his record. It might impair his chance of getting employment again. In some cases it might limit or annul his claim to a pension. There are difficulties of this kind every year, but I want the Committee to consider the effect upon children in a school where there is friction of this kind between the managers and the teacher. In many cases in my own knowledge the educational system has been upset for months and years by these quarrels and disturbances. Parents have withdrawn children from schools, and fresh schools have been opened. Parents have refused to recognise the teacher brought in at the point of the bayonet, so to speak, to replace the dismissed teacher. These things are known to the Board of Education, and to the inspectors and officials, and to hon. Members. I venture to hope that this debate will not close without an assurance being given by the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President that the Department will undertake to do something to prevent this kind of thing in future, and to see that teachers obtain some protection against capricious dismissal. I heard of a case the other day where a teacher who was four months short of the period necessary to qualify for a pension was dismissed by the managers of the school. The dismissal of that teacher left him unable by four months to complete his term of qualification. He is approaching the age of sixty-five, and in this country it is true that a teacher over forty or forty-five has a very small chance of getting new employment at all. I venture to say that in all cases of that kind the Board of Education ought to interfere. The Board of Education is all powerful when once the Code is passed by the House. The Board of Education has the machinery and can satisfy itself as to the merits of any particular dispute. The Board could easily make it a stipulation that there shall be for the teacher and managers a form of agreement containing a clause which would give the teacher protection against unjustifiable dismissal. The Board could make it a condition of the grant that they shall retain to themselves the right to decide between managers and teachers in matters of dispute. I hope we shall have some assurance on these points. Can we have the extra grant for the training colleges? Can we be sure that the inspectors to be appointed in future shall be both men of academic distinction and experience in schools? Above all—and it is a matter of importance at the present moment, because of the operation of the Act of 1898—can we have from the right hon. Gentleman an assurance that he will, to the best of his ability, secure that teachers whose lives are in the right and whose efficiency is unquestioned, shall have protection against dismissal arising from difficulties of creed, politics, or temper without any reference whatever to the efficiency of the work of the school?

*COLONEL MILWARD (Stratford-upon-Avon): I desire to support in a few words the argument of the hon. Gentleman with reference to the dismissal of teachers owing to the friction between them and managers. I do not think the grievance very often occurs, but I feel that from time to time it is true that teachers are dismissed for inadequate reasons, and in that case they have no power of appeal. Although it is perfectly true that in many other walks of life men are dismissed from the positions they hold owing to the hardness of those who employ them, there is a difference in the case of school teachers who are quasi-public servants. I wish they were public servants altogether, but I think that in their present position they ought to have a right of appeal against arbitrary dismissal. A board of guardians cannot dismiss even the most humble servant without the right of appeal to the Local Government Board. I think the same thing should hold true in reference to school teachers, whose position is a difficult one and dependent upon a certain length of service for a pension. I admit that the right of appeal to the Education Department is a difficult question, but the difficulty might be overcome if a local educational authority was established. With a county or borough authority to which appeal could be made there would be a better chance of the real merits of the case being understood. The same may be said in reference to the complaints the hon. Member for Flint brought forward that teachers have taken advantage of their position to force upon the minds of children religious doctrines of which parents do not approve. Possibly there have been such cases, but I am convinced they have been few and far between. At the same time I have the greatest sympathy with Nonconformists who find themselves in a parish with only one school to which they can send their children, and in the management of which they have no confidence. On the other hand, it is quite clear that the country does not wish to see universal school boards, and that being the case, a local educational authority to which parents could appeal would be of the highest value. If there was a borough or a county authority, and if there was any complaint in regard to religious instruction it would be far easier to appeal to a local authority than to a central authority. May I say I think that all this points to the fact that the time is coming when there should be a review of the educational policy of this country. If you look to what is taking place in Convocation, and to the views expressed by educational authorities, you will find that there is a feeling in favour of a change. If the Government would have the courage of their convictions and introduce a local authority in education the alteration would give the greatest impetus that could be given to the education of the country.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): I am glad to think that of all those questions referred to by my hon. friend below the gangway the right of appeal, or rather the grant of some right of appeal, to teachers against arbitrary dismissal, is perhaps the one that comes most home to the educational mind. I was exceedingly glad to hear what fell just now from the hon. Member who addressed the Committee, because it shows that these feelings are not confined to one side of the House. It is perfectly obvious that the importance of this question has grown enormously since Her Majesty's Government started a superannuation fund for teachers. Before that the question of the possible right of appeal in the case of a teacher was one which chiefly appealed to what may be called the sense of dignity and importance of the office of schoolmaster; but it did not, except in a minor degree and indirectly, carry with it considerations of the important pecuniary interest now attached to the office of schoolmasters, who are obliged by law, after a certain date, to contribute a certain sum from their salaries to the superannuation fund. If they are dismissed before they have contributed for the full period indicated, they are liable to lose their pension and also the benefit of their contributions. My hon. friend who addressed the House just now spoke of certain cases which were within his knowledge. I think he acted wisely in not giving names and places. It is quite clear that the matters involved in these cases are matters of great delicacy, and that to name the cases and the individuals would, perhaps, increase the sense of hardship by giving them special publicity. I can certainly say for myself that I am acquainted with details of cases of arbitrary dismissal upon inadequate grounds by both Voluntary school managers and small school boards. The question of poor law schools is of urgent importance in the metropolis and many of the larger towns, but less so in small towns and country districts because of the wise provision in the Local Government Act, 1888, by which county councils can pay the fees of children and charge them to the Exchequer contribution to the county fund. The effect has been to encourage boards of guardians to send children to public day schools, and in the county of Wilts I do not think any children are educated in the workhouses. What is really required in the great towns is the benefit of the same machinery, because the obvious difficulty is that the number of poor law children in the metropolis might be so great as to swamp the schools of the districts. In what he said about training colleges and the grievances of Nonconformist teachers the Vice-President has shown his desire to meet the difficulty and has indicated the right course to pursue. This is one illustration among many of the difficulties that arise from the system of attempting to combine the benefit of denominational education with the benefit of the School Board system. As many hon. Members have already said in this debate, and nobody said it more clearly than my noble friend the Member for Greenwich, you have the supporters of the Voluntary system and the supporters of the School Board system, like cats on the roofs of two opposite houses, engaged in rivalry upon this question. The only result is that the supporters of the Voluntary system are strong enough to prevent the School Board system doing a great deal of useful work, and on the other hand the School Board system is sufficiently strong in many cases to prevent the Voluntary system getting the benefits which might be obtained from it. What we in this House, who should try to control and still these unfortunate rivalries, really want to do is to see whether some system cannot be invented which will give fairplay to both these principles without bringing them to stand in one another's way, strong enough to thwart one another but neither of them strong enough to get the upper hand and carry out their educational work. I can perfectly imagine, though I should differ from it, that if Parliament was to say that the Voluntary system should alone be recognised, and the whole of our educational system be organised according to the religious views of different parents or different sections of opinion, it would be possible on those lines to organise a great system of education capable of producing very good results. I can also perfectly realise that if we had a great system of undenominational education under such boards or other public authorities, there also great and admirable results must accrue to the nation which established such a system. But we have been obliged, for the reasons which prevailed in 1870, to arrive at a compromise—as we nearly always have to do in England. I would venture to say to the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich that all the arguments he used and the similar arguments used by others in this debate were the same as were used in 1870, and we had to come back to the Cowper-Temple Clause and the unsectarian system of education which that clause gives, simply because every other system failed to obtain a majority of this House. The end of all those long and bitter debates was simply that we had to arrive at a compromise. I venture to say that if the noble Lord was Minister for Education and tried to reduce into practice the ideas he has brought forward, he would find after long debates that it was not in his power to bring forward sufficiently strong battalions to overcome the opposition which those ideas would excite, and we should have to come back to the point we reached as long ago as 1870. We should have to recognise both of these great classes—namely, those who desire to have Voluntary schools and those who desire to have the School Board system. In whatever way we follow out those ideas, we shall always have more or less to recognise that those two great classes of ideas do exist, and that whether we agree with them or whether we do not, they are held by large numbers of our fellow-countrymen. All we can do is to go on adapting and extending our machinery without attempting too much. The point we seem to have come to is as to whether or not we can attempt to meet what has been acknowledged by the Vice-President, the First Lord of the Treasury, and the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich to constitute the real grievance of Nonconformists—namely, that there are an enormous number of parishes in which the whole control of the education of the children is in the hands of one denomination, and that denomination the Church of England, so that presumably the child of Nonconformist parents must be withdrawn from religious education or accept a form which is not that with which the parents agree. The idea of the noble Lord appears to be that we must attempt in some way or other to revive the famous 27th clause of the Bill brought in by the Vice-President, by which the child of Nonconformist parents was enabled to claim to receive within a Church school—I do not know from whom, whether from the minister of its own religious denomination or from the teacher of the school—a different religious education, and that therefore in all these schools there should be two systems of religious education going on. When that Bill was brought in the clause was universally condemned. [An HON. MEMBER: Not universally.] Not universally, but by a great majority of this House, and in matters of this kind we are obliged to consider the majority. The Bill broke down very largely because that clause did not receive from any quarter an amount of support sufficient to float it over all the shoals and difficulties in this House, and I do not believe it would be any use whatever attempting to revive that proposal. I may be asked what is the use of my criticising these proposals if I have nothing to propose myself. I will only say that the real difficulty and grievance has always appeared to me to consist less in the question of the religious education given to the child than in the management of the schools. The real grievance of the Nonconformist is not that his child has to go to a school in which he may be taught something in regard to religion of which the parent disapproves. There are exceptions, but as a rule I believe the clergy of the Church of England are not as unreasonable as some people imagine in regard to the actual religious education given in the schools. There is an enormous amount of religious education given in Church of England schools which is of a character that the child of Nonconformist parents can very well accept. There are cases where it is not so. You occasionally have an indiscreet clergyman or curate who causes great commotion far outside his own district by introducing high-flown notions about sacerdotalism, or by bringing in a special catechism invented by some High Church society to which he belongs, but such things are exceptional. The real grievance is that in an enormous number of parishes the whole control and management is in the hands of the Church of England, which in practice means, is in the hands of the clergyman of the parish, and therefore everybody who is not a member of the Church of England is shut off from the management of the schools. That has a very bad effect in two ways. It causes in the minds of Nonconformists a feeling of injustice, and educationally it has the bad effect of preventing a large section—and very often the most active section, and the section which takes the most interest in education—from having anything to do with the village school. If you want to interest the parents and the community at large in education, the first thing to be done is to make every parent and ratepayer feel that the village school is his school, that he has something to do with it, that he is interested in the management of it, and that it is possible he may be called upon to be a manager. These are the considerations I venture to submit to the Committee in regard to this question of education in our rural districts. This is a question which mainly affects our rural districts rather than the towns. In the towns there are generally school boards, and even where there are not such boards the Nonconformists as a rule are able to keep up a British school, to which they may send their children without any fear of their religious conscience being interfered with, and in the management of which Nonconformist parents are directly represented. But there are larger questions than these upon which I would venture to say a word. I want to ask the Vice-President whether before this discussion closes it is not within his power to tell us something as to what his Department is doing in regard to the Education Act of last year. I read with the greatest pleasure an article this morning in a paper which is not generally considered to be a revolutionary paper, or which is never looked upon as anything but a staunch supporter of Her Majesty's Government. I mean the *Morning Post.* That article was one of almost extreme bitterness in regard to the conduct of the Education Department, of the noble Duke who presides over it, and of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, for their neglect in fulfilling the expectations raised by the Act of last year. The article stated that it could only assume that the right hon. Gentleman and his noble chief were conscious that there was something slightly absurd in the Act coming into operation on the 1st of April, and that the coming into operation of the Act was wisely put off for a day in order that it should not be said in this House that the Act had been designedly started on All Fools' Day, because the conduct of the Education Department under the Act would have led anybody to suppose that the British public and this House were being made complete fools of in regard to the expectations of last year. The article points out that last year we were told that directly the new Minister of Education was appointed we should have a real re-organisation of the Department, that there should be three secretaries—one for primary education, one for secondary education, and one for technical education; but nothing whatever has yet been done, and no sign has been given that anything is about to be done. In addition to that, according to the Act itself, a consultative committee of experts was to be appointed, and we were told that this committee was to be a most important body. We all imagined that my hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University would be immediately placed upon that body, and that by this time we should be receiving the great advantage of his experience and knowledge, and perhaps that of the recently-elected Member for London University. But that consultative committee appears to have been completely forgotten. Is it or is it not intended to do something in this matter; and, if so, what and when? There is also another point. We have had a new Code, and we have had a Minute with regard to higher grade schools. No doubt both these documents are interesting and important documents, but, as has been pointed out in all these discussions, we have been placed at a great disadvantage because we were told last year that there was to be a great system of education—primary, secondary, and technical—and that when the Bill of last session became an Act we were to be allowed to consider the whole of this question together on one great and comprehensive scale. What has become of the Secondary Education Bill? The question is intimately connected with the Vote we are discussing to-night; it is still more intimately connected with the Minute in regard to higher grade schools. This Bill hangs fire from week to week and from month to month. We are told that the Bill is to be introduced either here or in another place. When is it going to be introduced? In every county in England, in every place, in every society, in every assembly where education is discussed, the cry goes up, "When is this Secondary Education Bill going to be introduced?" There are numbers of most useful schemes at this moment hung up simply and solely because people are not informed as to what is going to happen in regard to secondary education. The hon. Member opposite expressed a strong opinion in favour of having a county authority. I entirely agree with him. I have always regretted we were not able to obtain in 1896 the clause which dealt with the formation of county authorities. There were many objectionable things in that Bill, but I almost think I would have swallowed them all if we had been able to get the county authorities. I still hope we shall get the county authorities, and I want to know whether we are to be told anything this session in regard to this important matter. I would venture to press the question still further, and to ask whether there is any serious intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government, even if they introduce this measure, to pass it into law. It is a matter of injustice to the whole teaching profession and to the educational authorities of this country, and it is hardly respectful to this House that a promise of a great measure of this kind should be dangled before them from week to week and from month to month while at the same time nothing is done to redeem that promise. I do not think the Committee will be satisfied to be told that this is a matter for the noble Duke the President of the Council. This is the House which votes the money for education, and we are entitled to know what the intentions of the Government are. The Government have mentioned this matter in the Queen's Speech, and when a Bill is promised in the Queen's Speech the House is seized of the promise, and has a right to ask for its redemption, or, if it is not redeemed, to know why. I earnestly trust the right hon. Gentleman will be able to allay the apprehensions which undoubtedly do exist that the House is being played with upon this question, and to remove the feeling that we shall probably separate, perhaps never to meet again in this Parliament, without the fulfilment of this great promise in regard to secondary education—a promise which at the commencement of this Parliament, and at the General Election which preceded this Parliament, was dangled before the electors of the country, and had no small share in placing the right hon. Gentleman opposite in the position he holds to-night.

*Mr. **ERNEST GRAY** (West Ham, N.): Though I am a very young Member of the House, it has been my pleasure to hear the Educational Estimates introduced very frequently during the last twenty years. It was the practice of former Vice-Presidents to keep back the statistics referring to the education of the country until the debate took place, and then to give a few extracts from them, something in this style:—"That whereas the percentage of attendance in the schools during the past year was 87·4, it is this year 87·6; and although the progress has not been very marked, yet it is in the right direction, and the House may therefore be satisfied. That the number of children has increased by some few hundreds in the year, which is a further evidence of progress." And so the old practice went on year after year; Vice-President succeeded Vice-President in giving us these trifling statistical details, and I think that these methods did a very great deal of harm in the country; they lulled the people to sleep; the people thought the condition of our elementary schools was satisfactory; they pressed but few reforms upon the Education Department. But my right hon. friend has initiated a different form of procedure. I do not know whether it is because he loves being in a scrape. He told us during his statement this evening that he got into a great scrape recently for a statement he made, and I am inclined to think he will get into several more for some of the statements he has made to-night. But I believe he enjoys that kind of thing. At all events, he has succeeded in placing before the country some few truths which are not very pleasant to listen to, but facts which it is well the country should know; and though the right hon. Gentleman will be subjected to a large amount of criticism in regard to some of his statements, yet it is better we should have criticism than the lethargy and apathy which marked previous years. I admit I am often puzzled when the right hon. Gentleman is speaking. I have a shrewd suspicion that it is not always a departmental speech he is making. There are often indications that he is making a strong attack upon his own Department, and certainly he does not always appear to be cordially supporting the present Government. I am therefore sometimes a little puzzled as to the goal he is seeking and the object he has in view. If it be that from the knowledge he has gained in the Department and from the sympathy he has with child life he is trying to arouse that public opinion before which even the strongest Government must bow, I think the right hon. Gentleman is engaged in a good work, no matter how strange the procedure may at first sight appear. I believe he has done much during the last five years to arouse public opinion in regard to our schools, and I believe he himself would be surprised if he had the opportunities some of us have of ascertaining the great change which is taking place in public opinion outside this House on the question of the schools. If the next General Election be not completely overshadowed by one important topic, I shall not be surprised if this question of the schools plays a very large part in returning the next House of Commons. Many of the moderate men are sick and tired of these perpetual religious squabbles, and are heartily disgusted with the fanatics on both sides—with the Nonconformist who sees nothing but proselytising in the Church schools, and of the Churchman who sees everything that is godless in the Board schools. They cry out, "A plague on both your houses! Stand aside, and let the more moderate men of the country settle this question once for all, and give us a unified system of national education." It is significant that the debate initiated by the hon. Gentleman opposite collapsed almost instantly, and I am not going to trespass on the indulgence of the House by attempting to continue it. There are points mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman which I should like to emphasise. He has taken up an entirely new topic to-night, one that has been left alone for too many years—namely, the system of teaching in our infant schools. Children from three to seven or eight years of age are systematically crammed. The notion among managers, both Board and Voluntary, teachers, and the Department itself, until within recent years, was that the great object of school work was to impart information rather than to develop intelligence. I recollect going into a large school at Munich a few years ago, and, noticing the early hour at which the junior department came and the late hour at which they left, I remarked, "Do these children work all this number of hours?" and the directress of the department said, "Work? They never work." "Then what do they do all day?" I asked. "They play all day." The Germans in their infant departments realise the force of Montaigne's dictum that the games of the children are their most serious occupations. Now that the Department is breaking the fetters from off the teachers and setting them free, I do urge the Vice-President of the Council to see that the system they have destroyed is not reset up by school boards and by the Associations of Voluntary Schools. In the early days when the inspector went round to every school and dug up every tender plant to see how it was getting on, and then pushed it back into the soil again, grants depended upon those examinations, and the school managers having a keener eye to grants than to education, employed an inspector to go round in order to put the children through their facings before Her Majesty's inspector arrived. This used to be a sort of dress rehearsal. Now the Board of Education have declared the play itself to be injurious, but they still allow the dress rehearsal to go on. No one can tell the amount of mischief this practice is causing throughout the country. I have here the syllabus, or teachers' work-book, which is adopted by the Leeds School Board, which one would have thought was an enlightened and progressive authority. This work-book, which is to be filled up by the teacher, maps out every single subject to be taken in the babies' class, and every subject is split up into its separate divisions. These infants are inspected, and I remember a school where the inspector reported that the mental arithmetic of the lower babies was defective. I have a bundle of such reports which apply not to our much abused Voluntary school managers, but to one of your largest school boards which sends round its inspectors to the infant schools, and this is their conception of what the education of infants should be. In one of the schools to which I allude there was a report issued to the effect that good progress in handwriting was being made by the children of three years of age. There was also a report in one district to the effect that the pronunciation of the babies was defective. Conversational lessons, kindergarten, drawing, conversation, and scripture each had a separate report by this Board's inspector in the babies' class under the Leeds School Board. That is the system which is allowed to go on in Leeds. But what is the object of the change made by the Board of Education? Following the example of Continental countries very slowly, the Board of Education have concluded that this continual examination of the young child hinders its progress. What happened? When an inspector arrived your timid child always failed, and the courageous little mite who did not care a brass farthing for the inspector—although he might be the worst in the class—passed all right, and got the Government grant, while the timid and delicate little one failed. Looking at the question all round the Board considered that the individual examination of the children prevented the best methods being employed, and the teacher became an artisan instead of an artist. Teachers looked for grants and results instead of to education and the happiness which it might bring to the children. The Board of Education have now destroyed this absurd system, and they test the value of education given by the methods employed by the teachers. Now the Board ask, "Have you a competent teacher; are the methods you are employing thorough, sound, and educational; and are you as well equipped as the German and Swiss schools are with educational plant? If so, then the children are bound to make satisfactory progress." But while the Board of Education have thrown the old system aside themselves they are still permitting it by school boards and Voluntary school managers.

SIR J. GORST: No, no!

*MR. ERNEST GRAY: The right hon. Gentleman dissents from this, but will he tell us what he has done to stop this system? Have the inspectors been instructed to advise Boards to avoid this folly? Have the Associations of Voluntary Schools had it pointed out to them by any of Her Majesty's Inspectors what the result of this continual inspection of young children will be? For many years the Association of Voluntary Schools have employed organising masters as inspectors under another name. Of late years they have increased the number of these masters and given them more detailed work. The explanation is very simple because the Act will not allow these associations to expend money on secretarial work, and so they resort to the very simple expedient of making the secretary to the Board the organising master also. That sort of thing goes on in diocese after diocese. The inspector has to justify his existence and in some cases he goes round to school after school and undertakes this detailed examination. I have a report from one of these inspectors in the south of England, which covers six pages of foolscap. I do hope that the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President of the Council will not content himself by simply making eloquent addresses, but will go back to Whitehall and see that the principles he professes here are put into practice. If he cannot do this then let him come back here and tell us who is hindering these reforms. Above the kindergarten must come the popular school, and above that the higher elementary school and the technical institute, and for a very few indeed the higher schools and afterwards the University. But the foundation of all this will be your kindergarten system. When the private schools have disappeared and we are able to adapt ourselves to conditions such as prevail under a German system we may hope to see the kindergarten the real foundation of all intellectual educational work in this country. I wish some of those who look with suspicion upon the amount of money we are expending upon education and who talk about religious difficulties and nonsense of that sort, could go and spend a week in one of the great educational establishments of Zurich and Geneva and see what is being done all up and down the provinces abroad. There every person rich or poor sends his child off to the kindergarten school where the children get the foundation for the work of the higher schools. After this they realise that their course is clear right on to the University. But in those countries they get their children to attend regularly at school. The right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President referred to this point for a moment, but he might have spent a little more time in raising this great question. You may have the very best system of school management and the very best teachers, but you cannot get the best results unless the children attend regularly. What is the case in England? I intend to refer to this question again on account of a most remarkable statement which was made by the Lord President of the Council. The right hon. Gentleman made a speech in which he stated that in our English elementary schools we had an average attendance of 82 per cent.—that is, according to the returns, out of every 100 children no less a total than 18 are absent every day. The Duke of Devonshire stated that these figures were very misleading, and that they must not be accepted as an accurate record of the position. He went on to point out that a true estimate should be founded upon the number of avoidable absentees, and that from this total of eighteen you must eliminate all children who are ill and those who are absent owing to domestic trouble, and so on. What conclusion did the Duke of Devonshire arrive at? After taking these considerations into account he concluded that, instead of eighteen out of every 100 being absent, there were only about 6 per cent. absent through avoidable causes. I challenge the Vice-President of the Council to produce the evidence upon which that statement is founded. Let us have the figures before us. It is the universal experience of everybody familiar with the management of the schools of England that that figure is altogether inaccurate and altogether wrong. That statement is founded upon the assumption that the 18 per cent. of irregular children are evenly distributed all over the country. That is an entire fallacy. I was in Abergavenny the other day, and there I found that the average attendance of the children was something like 72 per cent., and how can you carry on your education successfully under circumstances like that? Your labour and your money might just as well be thrown into the gutter. You are starting and building your schools now upon the assumption that you will have 94 per cent. present. Now you have in Wales 25 per cent. of the children away from school every day. The figures are not even throughout the country. In some counties it is possible to obtain an attendance of 87 or 88 per cent., but in other counties it sinks down so low as 72 and 73 per cent. But what is the Vice-President of the Council doing in this matter? He deplores this again and again in his speeches, which upon this subject leave nothing to be desired. He has said that he would press it upon parents and local authorities that something should be done to get the children to attend school more regularly, but what is he doing? There is active hostility to this on the part of some parents, school attendance committees, and small school boards. Some 2,400 school boards exist, but my opinion is that we could do comfortably without 2,000 of them. Many of these small school boards are composed of five members, who possess but the barest conception of their duties. Some of them actually employ the children who ought to be in the school. Some of these school attendance committees meet every two months, and it is their duty to appoint an officer to look after these irregular children. Go down into South Wales, and you will find that the man who collects the tolls is appointed by the board to look after the children who do not attend regularly. In some cases the officer employed is paid £2 per annum for performing this duty. What does my right hon. friend do with these school boards? I have begged of him to appoint inspectors of attendance who would go round and see how these authorities are discharging their duty, but I have not yet heard if he is prepared to do that. The Blue-books are full of laments from the inspectors that they cannot get the children to attend school. And yet the school attendance committees and defaulting school boards are not compelled to carry out the law. My right hon. friend will perhaps reply that we have a Bill before the House which will remedy this, but very little progress is being made with that measure, and I begin to fear that that little Bill may be lost to us, and that this state of things will continue. I must apologise for touching upon this subject again. I almost regret having to bring questions of this detailed character before the Committee, but if hon. Members could realise as I do how the work of the school is hindered, and the amount of mischief which is caused by this irregular attendance of the children, then they would not be surprised at my anxiety that this subject should be pressed home. It is not merely that the children who are absent lose the benefit of the instruction, but they also do an immense amount of mischief to the children who do come regularly to school. If the Board of Education take a decided policy on this question I am sure the great majority of parents would support them. With the indulgence of the Committee I desire to refer to one other question. I venture to endorse the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President that if you want a proper system which will work successfully in your schools you must have the children attending regularly. On the other hand if you want to induce the parents of this country to send their children regularly to school there must be the assurance that when they are there they will be properly taught. Many of the working classes deny themselves, and have to pinch and economise in order that their children shall go to school. No one knows this better than the hon. Members who represent factory districts. If we force parents to send their children to school it is our duty to see that those children are properly educated. I do not think that even the right hon. Gentleman will contend that all our teachers are properly qualified for this work. So long as you allow nearly one-half of the children of this country to be taught by mere boys and girls, who are nothing but apprentices; so long as you allow some 17,000 young women, with no other qualification but the age of eighteen and vaccination, to teach, or pretend to teach, in your schools, you are hardly justified in compelling every parent to send his children into such schools. Such a state of things is a fraud upon the parents. It is robbing the children of part of their education, wasting public money, and failing in our duty to the people to allow such utterly incompetent persons in our schools. It is ridiculous to talk about such persons teaching, for they cannot teach. It must have been one of these teachers who said that the hare was another name for a rabbit. I once heard of a teacher who told the children that Cinderella was the first Queen of England. I have seen the handwriting of some of these teachers, and they have not the ghost of a notion of how to write a letter. Some of them have been housemaids, and others have become tired of the needle. Therefore they are of the cheap and nasty order, and this is money thrown away. Of course the inspector has to approve of them, but it is simply a case of Hobson's choice. If he does not take that article he has nothing else. I am sorry to say that by far the great majority of these incompetent teachers are in the Voluntary schools. And why? Certainly not with the free will of those who employ them. It is simply because the funds are not sufficient to allow them to put a decent staff into every school. About 2,000 of these teachers are in board schools. Under the London School Board the young person of the age of eighteen as a teacher is absolutely unknown. Under the London School Board 81 per cent. are trained certificated teachers who are properly qualified, and only 4 per cent. are uncertificated adults, and they do not employ a single one of those incompetent teachers. In the county of Monmouth, instead of 81 per cent. as under the London School Board, only 26 per cent. are certificated teachers, and no less than 30 per cent. are uncertificated assistants. No less than 29 per cent., or nearly one-third, of the teachers in the Board and Voluntary schools in the county of Monmouth are apprentices who would not be admitted into a Swiss school. In Cologne they tried our system thirty years ago, but they found it was bad and they got rid of it, and until the teachers are properly trained they are not now allowed to practise upon the children. In the county of Monmouth no less than 15 per cent. of the teachers come under Article 68. What is the Vice-President's Department doing to see that these schools are properly staffed? His reply, I am afraid, will be that a year ago they made some attempt to improve the conditions and limit the number of these teachers, but the House of Commons thought differently. I suppose that one must not criticise a vote given in the House of Commons, but I do wish that the right hon. Gentleman would try another experiment, and come down to the House again and tell us clearly what is necessary for the sound education of the children, and if he fails to get the support of the House he should throw himself upon the country to see whether the people will support him or not. I do not believe that the vote given in this House truly represented the state of the feeling outside. I feel confident that the people of this country wish their children to be well taught and that the school managers would employ competent teachers if they had the money. We want proper control and management and the necessary funds to carry out this object. At Oxford some French friends of mine asked me why we employed these pupil teachers if they were so bad, and what answer could I give? Simply that England was too poor to give better grants. Is England too poor to support its schools? The battles of the future will be fought between the intellect of nations, and the nation will win those struggles which best fits out its schools and which relies most upon the equipment of its young children. England, I am afraid, is resting satisfied upon what it has accomplished, and I hope the Vice-President's speech will do something to remove some of that apathy. It is not a question merely of the training of the children, and it is not a domestic matter. I am not pleading simply on behalf of the child or the working man's home, but the question is one of infinitely greater importance. The question is whether the electorate of a few years hence who will have to build up this House and control the destinies of the Empire, will be a wise and understanding people. They may be if the Board of Education will secure for them these reforms, but I am certain that if we go muddling along in our schools in the way which has characterised our policy during the last twenty-five years, we have nothing to look forward to but defeat at the hands of the Germans, and in some trades at the hands of the Swiss, and also an ignorant electorate, than which there could be no greater disaster to our country.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon, etc.): The speech delivered by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down does a great injustice, perhaps rather unintentionally, to my part of the country. He has held Wales up as the one part of Great Britain where the attendance is execrable. I am sure the hon. Member for North-west Ham does not wish to be unfair to Wales, but it is exceedingly difficult for children of a tender age to attend school in some parts of Wales. In a mountainous country the hon. Member must know that it is difficult to send a child five years of age some four or five miles to the nearest school. Therefore the hon. Member cannot fairly compare the attendance in a mountainous district with the attendance in other counties in this country. It is a gross piece of unfairness, and I am sorry that the hon. Gentleman has (not for the first time) been guilty of it. As a Welsh Member I thank the Vice-President for his references to the efforts which Wales is making to improve its educational system. He spoke of them in very eulogistic terms, and yet the hon. Member for North-west Ham lectures the Welsh community on their own educational system, which they understand considerably better than he does. The hon. Gentleman was very severe on those who complain of the grievances under which Nonconformists in this country suffer as regards educational matters. I observed that the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, although I would not for one moment suggest that he has any excessive sympathy with Nonconformists, admitted the grievance. Other hon. Members opposite also admitted it, and it was reserved to the hon. Member for North-west Ham to get up and talk about the grievances of Nonconformist children, to quote his own words, as "nonsense." But I may point out to him that his own speech was a complete refutation of that accusation. The hon. Gentleman also, referring to the motion of my hon. friend the Member for Flintshire, in respect to which my hon. friend is the spokesman of millions of people in this country, said that it was all nonsense and that there was no such grievance.

*MR. GRAY: I did not describe religion as nonsense, but the platform religious difficulty as nonsense.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The words of the hon. Gentleman were that the religious difficulty in schools was all nonsense, and yet his own speech offers a complete refutation of that statement. What is one of his own complaints with regard to the educational system? It is that Article 68 teachers are a necessity in the Voluntary schools because the schools have no funds to pay better teachers. How is it that they have no funds? It is true that they have a large grant from Imperial sources, but they cannot supplement it by local aid. Does the hon. Gentleman mean to suggest that they can get local aid to place Voluntary schools on the same footing as Board schools without giving local control? And if local control is given then the religious difficulty disappears. Take some of the parishes referred to over and over again to-night, where the bulk of the population is Nonconformist, and where the only State school is under the control of the minister of another denomination. What would happen if local rates were summoned to the aid of that school? You would have local representatives on the committee of management, and the school would cease to be a sectarian school, and would become a parochial school under a committee of management representing the bulk of the ratepayers. Does not that mean that the religious difficulty is at the root of the whole business? [Mr. GRAY dissented.] The hon. Member shakes his head. Can he point out to me how he is going to raise this fund without getting local control?

*MR. GRAY: Yes. In the case of Evangelical and Roman Catholic schools in some of the towns of Western Germany, which give the religious education the parents require, no religious difficulty arises.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: In Catholic districts in Germany there are Catholic schools, but that is because the bulk of the ratepayers are Catholics. In other districts there are Protestant schools, because the bulk of the ratepayers are Protestants.

*MR. GRAY: You have them both side by side.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: But if you have them both side by side there is also a committee of management. I challenge the hon. Gentleman to give a single case on the Continent where a Catholic school in a district is the only school and where the majority of the people are Protestants.

*MR. GRAY: Oh, yes, there would be no difficulty in proving that. I cannot give a case where there is only one school, but it is perfectly possible to have an authority managing the whole education of an area, and under that authority you can have a Roman Catholic school and a Protestant school in each of which the religion required by the parents is given. I have seen it done, and such people laugh at the religious difficulty and know it is non-existent.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: So well they might laugh, because it is a totally different system from the system in this country. The hon. Gentleman is evading the point. I am giving a case where the only State school is managed by a clergyman representing the minority of the population, the bulk of the population being Nonconformist. The hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well that there is no similar case to be found on the Continent.

*MR. GRAY: Oh, yes; there are dozens of them in Belgium.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It is perfectly true that there is a grievance in some parts of Belgium, but in the vast majority of cases there the population is Roman Catholic and there is no large Protestant minority. I do not think there is a single case where the majority of the people being Protestants the school is managed by a priest of the Catholic Church. In Switzerland the teachers are appointed by a committee representing the ratepayers in the district, and yet the hon. Member quotes Switzerland as a country where no religious difficulty exists. Nor would there here if we followed the Swiss system. Let me take another case as showing that the religious difficulty is at the bottom of our educational trouble. What happens in regard to the training colleges? I find there are six undenominational training colleges which have 294 vacancies. But there were 511 applicants who passed in the first class, which meant that there were 217 applicants who had passed in the first class who were excluded from these colleges for want of room. What happens in the denominational colleges? They have more vacancies than can be supplied out of the first class, and those vacancies have to be made up, not out of the 217 applicants who had passed the first class and were excluded from the undenominational colleges, but out of second-class and sometimes third-class candidates who were willing to take denominational tests. That means that 217 teachers who had passed in the first class are excluded from the teaching profession for the benefit of teachers of second or third rate ability, simply because the training colleges have got denominational and sectarian tests. And yet in face of these facts the hon. Gentleman says that the religious difficulty is nonsense. The religious difficulty is at the root of all our trouble. The hon. Member talks of England being poor, when she is spending 200 million pounds in war and in preparation for war. England is not too poor to expend money on education. The difficulty has been pointed out by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich in his exceedingly candid speech. It is that we have got two hostile systems in this country, each watching the other and barring the way. The hon. Member knows as well as and probably better than most hon. Members that it is part of the policy of the friends of the Voluntary schools in most districts to keep down expenditure on the education in Board schools. It is a kind of economy, but it is not brought forward for purposes of economy. They do not want money expended on the Board schools because they do not want the Board School system to spread. What is the effect on the Voluntary schools? I have voted against every proposal to give the Voluntary schools a single penny unless it is accompanied by local control. The friends of the Voluntary schools vote against money being given to the Board schools, and we thus have two hostile systems entwined as it were in this country. This is a state of affairs that ought to be put an end to, and I was very glad to hear the suggestion of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich as to an agreement between the two parties. I am afraid it is impossible in this country to do away altogether with all sectarian teaching, but I am perfectly certain that, if the friends of both systems were to meet there might be a way out of the difficulty. There was one thing the noble Lord said which I was rather sorry for. He said very frankly that he admitted the grievance of the Nonconformists, but he said practically that as long as they inflicted a grievance in certain districts on the other side their own grievance would be continued. That did not strike me as a very Christian principle, or one that should be put forward in the interests of religious education. The grievance is undoubted. What we complain of is this—and it is the principal grievance of Nonconformists — that in about 8,000 parishes of England and Wales the children of Nonconformists are excluded from the teaching profession. The First Lord of the Treasury did deny that, but I think, if he will allow me to say so, he has not gone very much into the question.

LORD HUGH CECIL: The children are obliged to be taught the religious opinions of their parents.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I do not think that is so much the grievance. The grievance of the Nonconformist parent is first of all that he has nothing at all to do with the control of the public school. He may have control of the parish pump, but he has no voice whatever as to the education of his children; and the other grievance is that his children are excluded from the teaching profession except on the condition that they attend the services of the Church of England. That is an undoubted grievance. I know the Vice-President will deny it.

SIR J. GORST: Oh, no! I said it was a most excellent theoretical grievance.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I will give a case in point, and ask the Committee if it is a theoretical grievance. The Wesleyan Conference went into the matter very fully, and they found that out of 980 schools, practically the only State schools in their districts, and under the management of the Church of England, tests were imposed in no less than 890 cases.

SIR J. GORST: Did they find any single case in which a Wesleyan child was prevented from becoming a pupil teacher by belonging to that sect?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, they did. I have got a case here which happened in the west of England. But even if that were not so, the right hon. Gentleman knows that that is not a fair way to put it. Suppose we find that the majority of children in a given school are Dissenters, and that in that school no Dissenters have ever been allowed to become teachers. It is perfectly true that we cannot prove that the schoolmaster went to such and such a boy or girl and said, "Unless you become a member of the Church of England I cannot entertain your application to become a pupil teacher." But if you get 800 parishes where the bulk of the children are Wesleyan and you find that no Wesleyan has ever been a teacher, it is perfectly fair to draw the inference that the test is imposed in such cases. I know from personal observation, as does every hon. Member that represents a Nonconformist constituency, that there are tens of parishes where the children are in the main Nonconformists, but in which no Nonconformist has ever been known to become a pupil teacher within the memory of man. That is the experience in my own constituency, with one or two exceptions; and although you cannot prove that such and such a boy was deterred from entering on the teaching profession because he was a Nonconformist, is it not fair to infer, if you draw all your teachers from the sect to which the clergyman who manages the school belongs, and not from the denomination to which the children belong, that tests are imposed? These are schools for the purpose of teaching children the doctrines of the Church of England, and I think it is perfectly right as long as this system remains in existence that children belonging to a particular Church should be taught by teachers who are members of that Church. There is nothing at all in that which any clergyman may disavow. But this is the real test which I have asked the right hon. Gentleman over and over again to consent to. Will he consent to a Return of all the teachers in Voluntary schools who are members of any other denomination except the Church of England? This is a real and very substantial grievance. Every religious denomination in the kingdom has petitioned the Board of Education to remove it. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich frankly and honestly admits it, and the Vice-President of the Council is alone in saying that it is a purely paper grievance. I ask him to put it to the test by granting the Return I have asked for over and over again, and if he does he will see that it is a very substantial grievance and ought to be removed.

Sir J. GORST: I will now proceed to answer the various questions put to me, but I will not answer the question put by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, because I answered it a few weeks ago when the hon. Gentleman made exactly the same speech, and I told him then that it was quite impossible for the Education Department to make an inquisitorial search into the religious opinions of teachers. I not only said that a few weeks ago, but I said the same thing on many other occasions when the same question was put to me during the five years that I have been at the Education Department. It is the officials of the Education Department who protest against a precedent being set for an inquiry by them into the religious opinions of the teachers. Now in the first place my hon. friend the Member for East Somerset asked me a great number of questions about the secondary education branch of the Board of Education. The Act of last session only imposed on the new Board of Education with reference to secondary education two functions. One was to undertake certain powers of the Charity Commissioners transferred by Order in Council, and the other was to inspect such of the secondary schools as asked for inspection. The Order in Council transferring the powers of the Charity Commissioners is now on the Table of the House, and if the House assents to it it will come into force on the 1st of November next, so that there is still ample time for the Board of Education to make the necessary arrangements. With regard to the inspection of secondary schools, I am informed that very few secondary schools have up to the present applied to the Board of Education to be inspected—not more than about a dozen. Most of them are making inquiries as to the conditions of inspection, and therefore it is rather premature to find fault with the Board of Education, because all these matters are not now before the Committee. With regard to the organisation of the Department I can only give my hon. friend the answer which I gave a few weeks ago, and that is that the matter is still under the consideration of the President of the Board of Education, and that he hopes shortly in another place to make an announcement on the subject. My hon. friend asked me some questions as to the draft Order in Council which is before the Committee. Undoubtedly the powers according to the text of that Order will be concurrently exercised by the Charity Commissioners and the Board of Education; but an arrangement has been made between the Departments which will prevent any overlapping, and there is a distinct arrangement between them as to what powers should be exercised by each.

Sir F. S. POWELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman state to whom a communication should be addressed?

Sir J. GORST: I think communications should be addressed to the Secretary to the Board of Education after this Order comes into force. My hon. friend also asked me why the transfer of certain powers is restricted to Wales. The answer is that the case of Wales is rather more urgent than that of England, because in Wales an Intermediate Education Act is in force, and it is more important that secondary educations powers should be applied earlier there. We have no intermediate education at the present moment in England, and the expectation is that the experience derived from the administration of these powers in Wales will guide the Board of Education in the transfer of further powers to England. The third point to which my hon. friend referred was that there was no transfer of powers in connection with the Board of Agriculture. There is, however, no occasion for that, because all the powers of the Board of Agriculture are exercised by the Board of Education already. The fact is that the Board of Agriculture does nothing either in primary or secondary schools: its function at present is confined to making certain grants to agricultural colleges. With regard to the observations of my hon. friend as to continuation schools, I entirely agree. I think it is most desirable that the administration of the grants to evening continuation schools in rural districts should be exercised by the county council, and should be managed by the secondary education branch of the Board of Education. That, of course, is a matter which will require some consideration. It is now under the consideration of the Board of Education, and I hope that before very long an arrangement will be made satisfactory to my hon. friend. My hon. friend the Member for Wigan also asked me about Clause 7. The announcement of the intention of the Government to establish secondary educational authorities has, of course, put an end to the voluntary arrangements under that clause. Twenty-eight out of forty-nine administrative counties have formed committees under Section 7, and fifteen out of sixty-one county boroughs. The hon. Member for the Hoxton Division and other hon. Members spoke about poor law children. I entirely agree with my hon. friend the Member for West Bradford that the real solution of the difficulty is that all poor law children should be sent to ordinary elementary schools. There is now no difficulty whatever about it. The plan was invented in Sheffield, and it has now been adopted in several counties as well as in large towns. The children, instead of being taken into the workhouses, are boarded out in houses scattered in various parts of the town or district in small numbers, twelve or so in each house, and from these houses they attend a public elementary school—Board or Voluntary—and mix with the ordinary children. They mix with the ordinary children of the town and are as much as possible dissociated from all connection with the workhouse. In other places there is nothing to prevent the children living in the workhouse and attending elementary schools; and although life in the workhouse is very bad for them, it is very much mitigated by their attending the elementary schools. I remember myself being present at the Poplar workhouse when something approaching 200 of these children, who were living in the workhouse, came in from attendance at the elementary schools where they had been receiving their education. The only cases to which the remarks of the hon. Member apply are what are called the large boarding schools. I must confess that these large boarding schools are very bad institutions, and the sooner they are done away with the better. I have no desire to give a kind of testimonial from the Education Department to the efficiency of these schools by undertaking a sham examination of the mere elementary instruction which is given in them. I quite agree with what the hon. Member for Hoxton said, that it is a very great misfortune that the children of the country are not all under one Department. Some are under the Poor Law Board, and some under the Home Office. My private opinion is that that is a very bad arrangement. Those under the Poor Law Board get the workhouse taint, and those under the Home Office get a kind of prison taint. It would be very much better if all the children of the country were placed under the charge of one Department. If that cannot be done, it seems to me it would be a very unfortunate arrangement if you were to establish in these schools, which I trust are fast disappearing, a kind of double authority; because if you had the Local Government Board giving instructions in respect to these children in one direction and the Education Department in another, you must inevitably have friction between the two Departments. In fact this arrangement, which formerly prevailed, was cancelled in 1863, and it would be very inadvisable to revive a system already tried and found wanting. The hon. Baronet the Member for North Norfolk and the hon. Member for Rossendale both expressed apprehension that my remarks applied to the kind of infants' schools in which they were interested; but these were not the schools to which my earlier remarks were directed. That sort of infants' schools are highly to be commended, and they might be extended throughout the country with advantage. My remarks applied to the common type of infants' schools in this country described by the hon. Member for North-west Ham, where infants at the tender age of three are drilled in reading, writing, and arithmetic—a proceeding to which I object as much as the hon. Member. I have seen infants' schools in which the children really play, and where their brains are not cruelly exercised. There is one I know very well in the South of London where the children are employed in making what we in our younger days would have called mud pies, but what is now called clay modelling. In this school, which is presided over by a lady who I suppose has been trained under the kindergarten system, the reading, writing, and arithmetic are relegated into the background. The children are hardly taught at all; but they are taught clay modelling, drawing, and colouring with water, and the results are most extraordinary. The children are delighted, but they never read or write, and never do mental arithmetic. It is said by the inspectors that when these children are turned out of these infants' schools into schools for higher children, they are better readers and writers and even better arithmeticians than the children who had been drilled in schools where their little brains were exercised prematurely. I hope the remarks I made about infants' schools will not be misunderstood. I most highly appreciate schools of that kind; but what I want is to get the country to realise that many of these children are put into schools where they do not play, and where their poor little brains are exercised prematurely, with great disadvantage to the infants. The hon. Member for Rossendale, I think, was very unreasonable in complaining that the higher elementary schools had not been already established. The Minute was only laid on the Table just before we adjourned for the Whitsuntide holidays. The hon. Member must give the Department a little time. Applications have already been received for a number of these schools, and I have no doubt that some arrangement will be made for establishing such schools after the vacations. A question has been asked by the noble Lord the Member for Cricklade as to when the Secondary Education Bill will be introduced. I understand that it will be introduced shortly in another place, but the exact day I am unable to fix. The only other point to which I need refer is the question of dismissal of teachers. That question has been forced on the attention of the Government by a great number of speakers on both sides of the House. I must frankly admit that I think it will be necessary, will be inevitable, after the passing of the Act by which pensions are given to teachers, to bring in some measure to prevent their unreasonable and improper dismissal. I think the Education Department has a right to do this, because, as has been said by some of the speakers, those who pay the piper have a right to call the tune, and the Education Department does pay the greater part of the teachers' salaries. Therefore, I think they have a reasonable right to have a voice, at least, in the dismissal of the teachers. I do not think, however, that the question needs legislation; it can be done by means of a Minute. There is no impossibility in making such an arrangement as that without constituting the Education Department a Court of Appeal in every possible case, which would be quite impracticable. I think there would be no difficulty in obliging managers, whenever they dismissed a teacher, to give a written statement of the ground on which that dismissal has taken place, leaving to the Education Department the right of saying whether that ground was reasonable or not. I have expressed my own opinion about the question; I might have gone further and said that it would be considered by the Department, if I was not afraid of the hon. Member for West Nottingham. I understand that the theory of the hon. Member for West Nottingham is that no physician has any right to diagnose any disease until he is prepared to effect an immediate cure. I undertake, however, that when the Code to be introduced next year is considered, this matter also will be considered, and that I will represent what has been said to-day to my noble friend the President. I hope that the wisdom of the new Board of Education will be able to find out a solution of the difficulty, so that teachers will have reasonable security that no rash and capricious dismissal should deprive them of the advantage of the pension they have earned, and the security of their position to which they are entitled.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): At this hour of the evening I wish to confine my observations to a few points which have arisen in the debate, and especially to that last mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman—namely, the tenure of the teacher's office, and the right of appeal against capricious dismissal. I think that the debate this evening has satisfied the Vice-President—indeed, I gathered from his speech that he admits that there is little or no difference of opinion on this subject. I was extremely glad to hear him give the assurance, which we may take practically as a promise, that this matter will be dealt with in the Code. It is a matter of the highest importance to the teaching profession, not only because it is a corollary to the granting of pensions, but because it tends very much to increase the credit and standing of the teaching profession. One of the best means by which to induce men of superior character and ability to become teachers is to give an assurance that they will not be subject to arbitrary dismissal hereafter. I would like to add, although I do not see the Lord Advocate present, that this is a question which has attracted a great deal of attention in Scotland, and I hope that what has been said by the right hon. Gentleman will be taken notice of by the Scotch Office, and that some similar provision will be made for Scotland as the right hon. Gentleman has promised for England. Another point to which I wish to refer is in regard to the training colleges. I do not think there is any desire to press the right hon. the Vice-President too far in relation to the hope he has held out in regard to these colleges, but we were glad to hear him speak to-night of the necessity of having more day training colleges. Residential colleges have rather a tendency to induce an ultra-professional and mechanical quality, and the cultivation of a certain set of ideas, as is not unnatural to men brought up entirely in a sort of seminary, and not moving in the larger intellectual and professional world. From these disadvantages day colleges are more free. Now, both the older universities and colleges have opened facilities for students who come from the outside to receive the best kind of teaching. That has been of great benefit; it has tended to raise the standard of the profession, and to diminish the chasm which used to yawn between the elementary and secondary teachers. The elementary teachers who come to the university feel themselves brought within the range and scope of the profession, and into closer touch with those who are trained for the secondary schools. These are considerable advantages, and I do not think the new Board of Education could do anything better than signalise its constitution by an advance in the direction of day training colleges. I hope we may take the words of the right hon. the Vice-President as more than a mere platonic expression of sympathy, and that he will proceed with steps by which the Board of Education will give effect to his ideas. If the right hon. Gentleman will only do so, I believe he will have the unanimous support of the House. Upon the other topics which have been raised to-night I will not enter, except one. I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he proposes to make known to the House, either by way of Minute or otherwise, the distribution of functions between the Charity Commissioners and the Board of Education. I understood him to say that under the new Order there would be concurrent powers, but that there is to be an arrangement by which some of these powers would be exercised by the Board of Education, and others exercised, as heretofore, by the Charity Commissioners. That is not an unreasonable arrangement, and certainly it would be to the advantage of those who have to deal with charities on the educational side. I do not suppose that an Order in Council will be necessary—in fact, it would be unsuitable—but there might be a Minute issued by the Education Department which might specify the different functions to be exercised by the Charity Commissioners and the Board of Education.

SIR J. GORST: The suggestion of my right hon. friend opposite is most valuable, and it will be considered.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 46; Noes, 128. (Division List No. 143.)

AYES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Birrell, Augustine
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Dewar, Arthur
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, W. P. (Merthyr)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thomas M.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)

Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudd'rsf'd)
Woods, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Samuel Smith and Mr. Lloyd-George.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Banbury, Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bill, Charles
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. E. T. D.
Cross, Herbert S. (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Fry, Lewis
Galloway, William Johnson
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Rbt. Trotter
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)
Hobhouse, Henry
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Lafone, Alfred
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Killop, James
Mellor, Col. (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Philip A.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Peel, William Robert W.
Pender, Sir James
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Tauntn
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

It being Midnight, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the Chairman left the chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

CRUELTY TO WILD ANIMALS IN CAPTIVITY BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

NEW BILL.

ELECTIONS (HOURS OF POLLING ON SATURDAYS).

Bill to amend the Law respecting the Hours of Polling at Elections, and to extend the Hours of Polling on Saturdays, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Flower, Mr. Marks, Mr. Charrington, and Mr. Harry Samuel.

ELECTIONS (HOURS OF POLLING ON SATURDAYS) BILL.

"To amend the Law respecting the Hours of Polling at Elections, and to extend the Hours of Polling on Saturdays," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 2nd July, and to be printed. [Bill 247.]

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 15th June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I was under the impression that this Bill would have gone over in the ordinary way, as I had placed on the Paper notice of opposition.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the hon. Member rose to object it would not go over. Very frequently hon. Members place notices of motion on the Paper, but do not insist on them. Of course, if the hon. Member had risen, the Bill would have been postponed.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I was advised that the fact of putting a blocking notice on the Paper was sufficient to secure delay.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member was badly advised. But he will have the opportunity of raising the question on the Third Reading.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Thank you, Sir. I will reserve myself for that.

Bill to be read the third time.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment).

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.
Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time upon Monday next.

LAMBETH WATER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

SOUTHPORT AND LYTHAM TRAMROAD BILL.

Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed.

BRITISH GAS LIGHT COMPANY (STAFFORDSHIRE POTTERIES) BILL.

As amended, considered; a Clause added; Bill to be read the third time.

CHRISTCHURCH AND BOURNEMOUTH TRAMWAYS (CHANGED FROM "CHRISTCHURCH, BOURNEMOUTH, AND WINTON TRAMWAYS") BILL.

As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

RICKMANSWORTH AND UXBRIDGE VALLEY WATER BILL.

As amended, considered; two Clauses added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

ST. DAVID'S RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

Not amended, considered; to be read the third time.

ALEXANDRA PARK BILL.

ASTON MANOR TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR BILL [Lords].

SOUTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

WHITECHAPEL AND BOW RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL [ANNUITIES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment out of the Revenues of India of any Annuities created under any Act of the present Session to provide for the vesting of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company in the Secretary of State in Council of India, and of any costs, charges, and expenses incurred under such Act (Queen's Recommendation signified), upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

LEITH BURGH PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (GAS) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

LONDON (ST. LUKE) PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for improving certain areas situated in the parish of St. Luke, in the county of London, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley.

Ordered, That Standing Order 193A be suspended, and that the Bill be read the first time.—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

LONDON (ST. LUKE) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for improving certain areas situated in the parish of St. Luke, in the county of London," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 248.]

LONDON (SOUTHWARK) PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for improving certain areas situated in the parish of St. George-the-Martyr, Southwark, in the county of London, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley.

Ordered, That Standing Order 193A be suspended, and that the Bill be read the first time.—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

LONDON (SOUTHWARK) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for improving certain areas situated in the parish of St. George-the-Martyr, Southwark, in the county of London," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 249.]

PETITIONS.

COMPANIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

COMPANIES BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COUNCILLORS (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT (1886) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table.

DISTRESS ABOLITION AND SUBSTITUTION BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (NEW CODE).

Petition from Bradford, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Petition from Islington, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Bolton, for alteration, to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) ABOLITION BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

INEBRIATES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) ACT (1854) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS).

Petitions for alteration of law, from Pilton; Wakefield (two); and Bodmin; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY BILL.

Petition from Guildford, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY BOARD (SCOTLAND) (SALARIES, ETC.) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MIDWIVES BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Derby; and Liverpool (three); to lie upon the Table.

PETTY CUSTOMS ABOLITION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HOUSES (SCOTLAND) LATER OPENING BILL.

Petition from Dumbarton, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petitions against establishment, from Grantown; and Kingussie; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Gloucester; Glastonbury; Luton; Martock; and East Dulwich; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against, from Northwich; Starcross; Bolton; Exeter; Ossett; Burslem; Dewsbury; Lincoln; Plymouth; and Devonport; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Birkenhead; Bamber; Bamber Bridge; Kennington; Glastonbury; Pilton; West Kirby; Hoylake; Liscard; Birmingham; Wakefield (two); Pumpsaint; Twynllanan; Cilycwm; Llansadwru; Celnberrach; Talsarn; Guildford; South Hackney; Castle Cary; Hackney; Leamington Spa; Dumbarton; Alresford; Stratford; Plymouth; East Ham; Bradford (seven); Addington and Ringstead; Durdham Down; Wisbech; Shrewsbury; Richmond; Sittingbourne; Abercanaid; Merthyr Tydfil (five); Cefncoedycymer (three); Plymouth; Rowbarton; Taunton (five); Thirsk and Sowerby; Hampstead (three); Birmingham (nineteen); Spitalfields; Bethnal Green; Lancaster; Northfield; Bourneville; Maidstone; Severn Street; Longbridge (two); Badsey; Brighouse; Wisbech; Barnsley; Luton; Eccles; Chesham;

Preston Patrick; Clevedon (two); Neath; Liverpool; Hereford; Edinburgh (two); Croydon; Manchester; Brixton; Dore and Totley; Kingsbrompton; Highworth; Dresden; Dowlais (two); Vaynor; Cwmaman; Abernant; Cwmbach; Aberaman (two); Lincoln (two); Troedyrhiw (two); Goole (two); Bennington; Lynsted; Diss; Doncaster; Lees; Acton Bridge; Holcombe Rogus; Topsham; Hirwain; Hay Hill; Bath; Coleford; Lower Weston (two); Tor; Ryhill; Torquay; West Melton; Middlesbrough; Cockington; Waltow Park; Sheffield (eleven); Milverton; Martock; Pandine; Llangewad; Bankyfelin; Kyffig; Mydrim; New Wandsworth; Oswestry; Farnworth; Bristol (four); Hopton; Bloomsbury; Chorley; Yardley; Ashford; Batheaston; North Walsham; Liverpool; Wrentham: New Whittingham; Willesborough; Clifton; Dorchester; Pontyclun (three); Bwylchygwynt; Barry; Weston; Gorwydd; Nottingham; Beckenham; Canterbury; Barry Dock; Walcot; Culmstock; Horwich; Mile End; Aberdare (thirty-three); Islington; Govan; Esholt; Manchester; Llanddimiol; Liscard; Swindon; Arnold; Barnstaple; Sheffield (two); Brighouse (six); London (three); Coningsby; Reigate; Northwich; Liverpool; Edinburgh; Shirland; Buckhurst Hill; Stonebroom; Allendale; Stocksfield; Bushey (two); Ywysybwl; East Dulwich; Anerley; Pontefract; Torquay; Nottingham; Southampton; Ealing; Saltash; Bushey Heath; Ebbw Vale; Rotherham; Oswestry; New Bushey; Derby (two); Strood; Llanfabon; and Bunhill Fields; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition in favour, from Motherwell; Aberdeen; Dundee (two); Perth (two); Glasgow (three); Liberton; Leith; Paisley; Deerness; Johnstone; Kilbarchan; Alva; Cobden Street; Dunscore; Arbroath; Strathaven; Edinburgh (four); Kincardine O'Neil; Dollar; and Lanark; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR (FORM OF INTERCESSORY PRAYER).

Petition from the Protestant Church of England Union of New South Wales, for withdrawal; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Taunton; Wakefield (two); Caio; Twynllanan; Cilycwm; Llansadwrn; Llanfihangel Aberbythych; Glastonbury; Dumbarton; Stratford; Barking; Guildford; Plymouth; Highworth; Manchester; Lees; Castleford; Islington; Sheffield; Pandine; Neath; Pontynyswen; Llanfihangel Abercowin; Kyffig; Exeter; Mydrim; Birmingham; North Walsham; Dundee; Eccles; Strood; Lewes; St. Ives; Hull; Gloucester; Longbridge (two); Luton; Chesham; Liverpool; Southport; Wellington; Clevedon; Hereford; Edinburgh; Croydon; Northumberland; Elim; Swindon; Macclesfield; Bargoed; Ynysybwl; Caerphilly; Ystradmynach; Stonebroom; Tregaron; Bridgend; Ebbw Vale; Llantrissant; Bath (two); Pembroke Dock; Risca; Bodmin; and Oswestry; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Caio; Twynllanan; Cilycwm; Llansadwrn; Islington; Llanfihangel Aberbythych; Llanddansant; Pandine; Pontynyswen; Bankyfelin; Kyffig; Mydrim; Llanddimiol; Ynysybwl; Ebbw Vale; Llantrissant; and Cadoxton; to lie upon the Table.

TEINDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Perth, against proposed alteration of Clause 109; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.

Motion made, for an Address for "Return showing the number of Experiments performed on Living Animals during the year 1899 under Licences granted under the Act 39 and 40 Vic., c. 77, distinguishing Painless from Painful Experiments (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 215, of Session 1899)."—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said he had listened with very great regret to this motion being put from the Chair at so late a period of the session. It was very necessary, if this information was to be of any use, that the motion should be made earlier in the session. A year or two ago he ventured to put himself into communication with the Home Office, and he then secured an assurance that in future the motion should be made earlier in the session. As matters now stood it would be the middle of July before the Return was in the hands of hon. Members, and it would be practically useless for all purposes of discussion. He wished strongly to protest against the habit which had grown up in recent years of presenting this Return so late in the middle of June. There was no reason why it should not be presented before Easter. Many years had elapsed since the House discussed the administration of these Acts, and a further discussion would certainly be necessary when the House was able to give its attention to less exciting matters than those which had occupied it during the whole of the present session.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): Attention was given to the representations of the hon. Member, and an effort was made to forward the preparation of the Return. I may tell the hon. Member that, though the motion is late, the Return is ready for the printer, and will, I hope, be issued in a week or ten days. Next session an effort shall be made to still further meet the hon. Member's wishes.

Motion agreed to.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) (DIETARIES).

Paper [presented 14th June] to be printed. [No. 205.]

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Copy presented, of Returns relating to the Council up to 31st March, 1900, with Estimate of Expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 206.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 25th May, 1900, declaring that Mr. John Roberts, Turnkey, Consular Gaol, Yokohama, Consular Service, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 4th June, 1900, declaring that Mr. James Alfred Dawson, Rural Postman, Post Office Department, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 6th June, 1900, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the Office of Sanitary Surveyor under the Board of Trade (Mercantile Marine Services), professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).

Copy presented, of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1898–9. Thirty-fifth Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897 (ASSOCIATIONS).

Copy presented, of List of (1) Associations constituted under The Voluntary Schools Act, 1897; (2) Associated Schools and Amounts of Aid Grant paid; and (3) Unassociated Schools and Amounts of Aid Grant paid, 1899-1900; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, 1899-1900.

Return ordered, "of the amount received in respect of each Administrative County and County Borough in England and Wales for Local Taxation Licence Duties and Penalties, under the Local Government Act, 1888, in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANK.

Return ordered, "(1) from each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives; the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended the 20th day of November, 1899; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the treasurer at the 20th day of November, 1899; the total amount of the separate surplus fund on the 20th day of November, 1899; other assets, including estimated value of bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Government stock standing to the credit of depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such a Return a list of all such savings banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vic. c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Banks; showing, in each case, the number of such Banks, as well as the number and amount of depositors' accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the officers of such banks respectively, and showing also the years in which such banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their depositors' balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the form of the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively, for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom: and (2) for the year ending the 20th day of November, 1899, showing the total number of depositors in trustee savings banks; the total number of deposits; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 297, of Session 1899)."—(*Sir John William Maclure.*)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—SIEGE OF LADYSMITH—DISAPPEARANCE OF STORES.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the War Office have received the proceedings in the courts-martial held on those concerned in the disappearance of stores at the hospital in Intombi Camp during the first two months of the siege of Ladysmith; and whether any further notice is to be taken of the matter.

*The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The only court-martial proceedings that have reached the War Office answering the right hon. Member's description are those concerning a staff sergeant of the Indian Commissariat Department, acting as sub-conductor, who was found guilty of fraudulently misapplying public goods to his own use on the 6th and 7th February in Intombi Camp. He was reduced to the ranks and given six months imprisonment with hard labour.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Has any report been received from Sir G. White?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think so.

LADYSMITH—SIR G. WHITE'S DESPATCHES.

MR. LAFONE (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if reports have been received from Sir George White on the siege of Ladysmith; and, if so, when will they be published.

*MR. WYNDHAM: As I have already told the House, I am not prepared to anticipate by way of question and answer any exercise which the Secretary of State for War may see fit to make of his discretion as to the publication of the despatches and reports on military operations.

MR. LAFONE: Although men who were shut up in Ladysmith have been home two months, we have yet no official information of what took place there.

ALLEGED CLAIM ON THE MAYOR OF LADYSMITH.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any information to the effect that a claim has been made by the Imperial Government on the Mayor of Ladysmith for food supplied during the siege from the military supplies for the maintenance of the inhabitants, many of whom had joined the fighting ranks.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have no information.

ALLEGED OUTRAGES ON BOER FEMALES BY BRITISH TROOPS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether an English infantry patrol of twenty men, while raiding near Dundee, entered the farmhouses of the absent Boers and outraged their wives and children, and were surprised in the act by Republican soldiers, and some of them shot; whether, in another place, also near Dundee, a family of six females, named Bester, aged respectively forty-five, eighteen, fourteen, twelve, and two younger children, were outraged by men of an English patrol; and whether he has any official information of such occurrences to communicate; and, if not, whether he will cause inquiry to be made into these allegations.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir, we have no information. I understand that the allegations referred to are based upon the reported conversation of an officer serving in the Boer army, and I do not think that we should be justified in asking the generals in the field to investigate charges which rest upon such evidence. The crimes referred to, if committed on active service, would be punishable by death; and I am confident that the authorities in South Africa would require no instigation from us to investigate any charges of the kind.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: But in view of the fact that it is stated that three or four soldiers were caught in the act and shot, is it not worth while to inquire?

[No answer was given.]

JAMESON RAID INDEMNITY.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the indemnity which the Chartered Company of British South Africa undertook to pay on the release of the prisoners after the Jameson Raid has become the property of this country by right of conquest; and, if so, whether immediate steps will be taken to claim a reasonable sum from the Chartered Company on account of the said indemnity, with interest for the last four years, and to apply the same towards the expenses of the present war.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The claim to the indemnity would remain that of the Transvaal Government. It is premature to say now what action may be taken by Her Majesty's Government in the matter hereafter.

RESIGNATION OF THE CAPE MINISTRY.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give the House any information with respect to the reported resignation of the Schreiner Ministry at the Cape.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not in a position to say more than that Mr.

Schreiner and his colleagues have tendered their resignations to Sir A. Milner, and that they have been accepted.

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES — HEAT FATALITIES—ARMY CLOTHING.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the deaths and suffering of the troops at Aldershot during the recent review were caused by unsuitable headgear and want of proper food; and, if so, whether he can state who is responsible, and what steps it is intended to take by the War Office in the matter.

Sir EDWARD GOURLEY (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the attention of the Secretary of State has been called to the verdict of the jury regarding the field day arrangements at Aldershot on Monday last, to the effect that the cause of the deaths of four men and 400 reported (besides unreported) cases of sickness was want of proper food before starting for the field day, want of adequate refreshment whilst actually engaged in the operations, and unsuitability of headdress worn; if so, can he inform the House who is responsible for the defects in the arrangements and what measures are to be adopted to avoid similar occurrences in the future.

Major RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the possibility of issuing a forage cap which will protect more than a third of a man's head, and an emergency ration for home service; and if the War Office will discourage the drill and manœuvre of troops when the temperature is of abnormal severity.

Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what are the results of the inquiry into the fatalities and casualties among the troops in the operations near Aldershot on Monday, and whether such risk will be obviated by amended regulations in future.

Mr. BARTLEY: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state how many soldiers suffered from the effects of sunstroke on Monday last at Aldershot, and how many died; whether the head-covering worn by the troops on that occasion was the same as that worn at the Salisbury manœuvres in 1898, when sixty-one cases of sunstroke occurred; and whether any, and what, steps have been taken since 1898 with a view of supplying the troops with some head-covering suitable to protect them from the effects of the sun.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: There are five questions on the Paper arising out of the deplorable and, I believe, unprecedented casualties which occurred at Aldershot on Monday, the 11th, in the names of hon. Members for East Clare, South-east Essex, Sunderland, East Northamptonshire, and North Islington. If these hon. Members will allow me, I will endeavour to cover all the points raised with which I am at present in a position to deal. The Commander-in-Chief directed by telegram on the 12th that an inquiry should be held, and a reply was received on the same day to the effect that action had already been taken. Reports have been received from the General Officer commanding, Aldershot, and the Surgeon-General. I have also had the advantage of speaking to the Adjutant-General, who returned from Aldershot this morning, but further particulars will be forthcoming from officers commanding the various regiments. The facts were as follows:—On Monday, the 11th of June, a field day was ordered at Aldershot, and a total of 18,002 men came on parade. The general order in force on all such occasions is that the men are to get their breakfast before starting, and that they are to be provided with light refreshments at some time during the day. The method of carrying out that order is left to the regimental authorities. The breakfast consists of bread and tea; and there is no reason to believe that any regiment failed to get breakfast before starting. The light refreshment may consist of sandwiches, but the most popular thing with the men is bread and cheese. The men dine on their return to camp, and very much prefer these arrangements to carrying an emergency ration, which would not be palatable unless a prolonged halt were made for cooking it. The light refreshment of sandwiches, or bread and cheese, may either be served out to the men before they start, for them to carry in their haversacks, or it may be arranged that a canteen cart shall meet the regiment at some specified point. That is a matter entirely for regimental arrangement, and one upon which it would be injudicious to lay down uniform regulations. On Monday morning when the troops started there was, the General commanding states, no exceptional heat; on the contrary he expected rain. But about 10 o'clock great heat began to be felt, and as it continued the "halt" was sounded at 10.30 and the "cease fire" at 11.15. It was then directed that the men should be marched back as easily as possible and with such periods of rest as their officers might think desirable. There is general testimony to the suddenness with which the heat wave came on; and, in particular, Major-General Hemming, commanding the division in which was the Highland Light Infantry, testified from personal observation that not a man of that battalion fell out before the march back was begun. On the previous day the General Officer commanding had personally instructed brigadiers and divisional commanders that their men, should they show any signs of fatigue, were to be halted, and, if necessary, to take no further part in the operations. But during the march back the severe heat was very much felt; a large number of men fell out; twenty-eight cases were received in hospital suffering severely from effects of the sun, of whom four have died, and twenty-nine suffering slightly. With the exception of these four men the other patients have made rapid recoveries. The whole distance covered by the troops was at the outside about fourteen miles, and in many cases less. On the question of the head-dress. In most regiments the head-dress worn was the field cap, of which I have placed a specimen in the Tea-room. This cap was designed to afford greater protection than the Glengarry, which it has superseded in the great majority of our regiments. The problem of designing an ideal field cap is not an easy one. The cap must be sufficiently light and compact to be carried conveniently in the breast or haversack of the soldier when wearing his helmet, and it is also impossible to ignore altogether the soldier's view of what constitutes a smart head-dress. Before this melancholy occurrence the Adjutant-General was at work on a sunshade to be attached to the field cap. But the best course is undoubtedly that all men in possession of helmets should wear them in summer time, whatever the forecast of the weather; and that men, principally in the Royal Reserves, who are still, owing to the exigencies of the war, unprovided with helmets, should not be allowed to undergo severe exertion at a distance from their barracks. The Colonel in command has notified to the General Officer commanding, Aldershot, his regret that this course was not adopted, and has directed that it shall be followed in future. Amid much that is regrettable I am glad to know that fourteen doctors and an ambulance were in attendance to mitigate the sufferings to which the troops were exposed by a sudden and unforeseen rise of temperature. I cannot conclude without expressing my regret at the attempt which has been made in some quarters to fix blame on particular individuals who are in no way responsible.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I hope the hon. Gentleman will be able to tell us, if not now at a later date, what actually happened with regard to the supply of food to the men. He has not told us at what hour the men started, whether the men were supplied with food before they started out, and whether food reached them when out or not.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I did state that the men were supplied with food before starting. I do not know whether food in all cases reached the men, because that is a matter as to which I must get the reports of the officers commanding the individual regiments. With the exception of the Army Service Corps and the Army Medical Corps, no troops started before six o'clock, and some not until eight o'clock or twenty minutes past eight.

MR. BARTLEY: Do I understand that the head-dress worn on Monday was the same as that worn during the manœuvres in 1898, when there were sixty-one cases of sunstroke?

*MR. WYNDHAM: In the majority of cases the field cap was in use in 1898.

MR. BARTLEY: But did not considerable discussion take place at the time, and was not some promise held out in 1898 that there would be a reform in the head-dress?

*MR. WYNDHAM: There has been some discussion, and attempts have been made to improve the head-dress. I still hold that the better solution is to wear the proper head-dress—the helmet—and not attempt to use the field cap for purposes for which it was not intended.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Is not the adoption of the slouch cap which has given so much satisfaction in South Africa under consideration?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I hope that some day the forces of the Empire may wear the head-dresses which have become dear to many of us owing to recent operations.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the difference between the temperature of Sunday and Monday was only five degrees?

*MR. WYNDHAM: The heat came on suddenly on Monday morning, but it was because the temperature had been excessive on Sunday that the General Officer commanding gave personal instructions to the brigadiers and divisional commanders.

In reply to a question by MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis),

*MR. WYNDHAM said: There were no signs of distress up to the time of the operations coming to a close. All the cases arose during the march back. Whether the men should be halted is a matter entirely in the hands, and it was left on this occasion exclusively in the hands, of the commanding officer of each particular unit.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: But were the men halted in accordance with the orders of the General? Will you ascertain that?

*MR. WYNDHAM: When I get all the evidence I will see what steps were taken. I have evidence that some of the regiments showed a great disposition to march on and were not checked by their officers.

SIR J. KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): Have I understood aright that the helmet is in future to be universally worn during manœuvres?

*MR. WYNDHAM: The Commander-in-Chief has issued instructions that in summer, whatever the weather, the helmet is to be worn, and that troops unprovided with helmets are not to take part in exhausting operations.

VOLUNTEERS—PAYMENT OF CAMP ALLOWANCES—LEAVE TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

MR. BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge): On behalf of the hon. and gallant Member for the Central Division of Sheffield, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the fact that numbers of Volunteers are working men needing weekly pay for the support of their families, and that neither the State nor private employers can allow more than fourteen days leave on civil pay, arrangements can be made for Volunteers receiving the allowances granted by the War Office if in camp for fourteen days or over every week during the camp instead of some time afterwards, when the returns and proportion of attendance to strength has been checked.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Under Paragraph 24 of the Memorandum of Instructions relating to pay in Volunteer camps, the pay and allowances in question are payable at such intervals as the brigadier or the commanding officer of the unit may direct. The matter is left to corps arrangements. The interpretation put by the hon. and gallant Member on the notification as to leave of Government employees is incorrect. The intention of the Government is to give a special extra leave of fourteen days. This, together with the Volunteers' ordinary holiday which many of them have usually devoted to the Volunteer camps, will in the majority of cases go far to make up a month's time in camp.

VOLUNTEER EMERGENCY PROPOSALS.

MR. BOSCAWEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Central Division of Sheffield, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the belief of some employers that if they give facilities for the Volunteers in their employ to go into camp for at least fourteen days, as required by the War Office, they will be expected to do the same every year, he will once more give a positive assurance that this special effort is only made this year, in consequence of the number of Regular troops out of the country.

*MR. WYNDHAM: May I remind my hon. and gallant friend of words which I used on the 12th March?—

> "I wish the House to understand distinctly that this is an emergency scheme for this year and this year only. . . . I wish the House to keep it in mind that it is because we are in a year of emergency, and it is because the Militia are embodied, that we make these emergency proposals with regard to the Volunteers."†

MOUNTED INFANTRY VOLUNTEERS —CAMP ALLOWANCES.

MR. BOSCAWEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Central Division of Sheffield, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if the capitation grant for Mounted Infantry Volunteers has yet been fixed, and if the camp allowance for the current year will be at the same rate as that decided upon for the Yeomanry.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The first question has led to a good deal of correspondence and discussion, but I shall be able to give the required information very shortly. The camp allowance will be at the same rate as for Yeomanry, provided that 50 per cent. of the strength of the company is present in camp for a fortnight.

H.M.S. "EUROPA"—BELLEVILLE BOILERS.

MR. ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state the number of days H.M.S. "Europa" took to steam to Australia, and what was her average speed during the voyage and consumption of fuel per day; whether he has any report of the Belleville boilers, fitted on this vessel, from the Admiralty inspector who was on board; what is the extent of the repairs necessitated to the boilers after her arrival on the station; and if the heat between decks was insupportable to the crew.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The number of days of actual steaming occupied by the "Europa" on the voyage from Plymouth to Sydney was forty-nine days. The speed varied from eleven to thirteen knots, the average being a little under twelve, which is about the usual speed for these voyages by Her Majesty's ships when there is no urgency. The total coal consumption was about 6,000 tons. The coal consumption of the "Europa" was known to be very large before she left England compared with that of her sister ships fitted with similar boilers, and for that reason an inspector of machinery was sent out in her to investigate the cause. This, so far as we know at present, he has not been successful in doing, and it is not probable that we shall be able to find out the cause of the high coal consumption until the ship returns to England, and the necessary examination of the engines, where the main fault probably lies, can be made. The ship was detained at Malta for some time while some experimental trials were being made, but these did not throw any sufficient light on the cause of the high consumption. No report has been made by the inspector of machinery attributing the fault to the Belleville boilers. No report has been received as to any repairs being required to the boilers since her arrival at Sydney. The stokers suffered considerably from the heat in the passage through the Red Sea, especially some of the younger men. There is no reason to suppose that the heat between decks was greater than is usual in other cruisers when passing through those regions.

MR. ALLAN: May I ask how many days the ship took in steaming from Plymouth to Australia?

MR. GOSCHEN: I have answered the hon. Member as to the number of days she was steaming. She was detained at Malta for a considerable time for trials.

MR. ALLAN: Is it not a fact that the men could not live between decks of the ship during her passage to Australia on account of the heat, and have not the men classed the ship as "H.M.S. Hell"?

MR. GOSCHEN: I have no information as to that.

MALTA—TUNNY NET TAX.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Governor of Malta, without the advice and consent of the representatives of the Maltese people, imposed a special tax on the use of tunny nets in Maltese waters; whether he is aware that last January, by a resolution in the council passed unanimously by the elected representatives, this order was declared to be rescinded, but was four days subsequently promulgated afresh by the Governor; whether remonstrances against this action, which affects the poorest class of the Maltese community, have reached the Colonial Office; and whether any communications on the subject have passed between the Colonial Office and the Governor of Malta; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

---

† See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxx., p. 612.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Governor of Malta has not altered the local laws relating to fisheries by the imposition of a special tax on the use of tunny nets in Maltese waters, but, in consequence of the increased attention which is being given to tunny-fishing in Malta, it has been decided to offer for public competition leases of sites for permanent tunny-traps in the territorial waters. On the 17th of January a resolution was passed unanimously by the elected representatives of the Maltese Council of Government, in which they objected to the grant of such leases by public competition, but the Governor disagreed with the resolution, because it appeared to be in the interest of private profit, and detrimental to public welfare. A memorial has been received from a Maltese respecting the grant of a licence for tunny-fishing, and has formed the subject of correspondence between the Colonial Office and the Governor of Malta; but I have received no general remonstrances of the kind suggested in the hon. Member's question. I am not prepared to take any steps in the matter.

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH BILL—THE APPEAL CLAUSES.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, with a view to the removal of existing uncertainties, he has any objection to stating the precise purport, scope, and operation of the proposed compromise clause of the Australian Commonwealth Bill referring to appeals to the Privy Council.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The effect of the proposed compromise is to prevent any appeal to Her Majesty in Council on any question of the class specified in the Amendment of which notice has been given, unless with the consent of the Governments concerned.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether it is a fact that in the negotiations the Queensland delegate was not consulted?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No; that is not exactly true. Of course, the particular communication in the first instance was with the delegates of the four colonies who had objected to the Amendment which we proposed to the original Bill. As soon as we came to an agreement with the four delegates in question the new agreement was communicated to the Queensland delegate.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is it a fact that complaint was made on behalf of Queensland that its delegate was not consulted?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No such complaint reached me.

TONGA—BRITISH PROTECTORATE.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any official information has yet arrived in reference to the mission of Mr. Basil Thomson to Tonga; and whether there is any ground for the impression conveyed by recent telegrams that the conditions of the proposed Protectorate are not acceptable to the King and Government of Tonga.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Only a brief telegram has been received from Mr. Thomson stating that he had proclaimed a Protectorate with the approval of the majority of the Tongans, and that the King stated he was satisfied.

ZANZIBAR—CHURCH MISSIONARY STATION AT RABAIS.

MR. DUCKWORTH (Lancashire, Middleton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Church Missionary station at Rabais, East Africa, has been declared to be outside the dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, and that the Protectorate flag now flies there in place of the Sultan's; and, if so, does it mean that all persons residing there and all persons settling there are free, and could the same course be adopted in regard to the mission stations at Mazeras and Ribe, both of which are in the same neighbourhood of Rabais.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Her Majesty's Government have no knowledge of any declaration placing Rabai outside the dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar; the position both there and at Mazeras and Ribe remains unaltered.

INDIA—BRITISH CAVALRY CARBINES.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state what proportion of the British cavalry in India is still armed with the Martini-Henry carbine.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Government of India anticipate that by the end of this month the whole of the British cavalry in India will be armed with magazine carbines. At present one regiment still carries single-loaders.

INDIAN FAMINE AND PLAGUE—STATISTICS—SUGGESTED ROYAL COMMISSION—PARLIAMENTARY GRANT, &c.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state the total number of persons on relief works in India, how long the present famine has continued, how many persons have died from hunger and disease, and what is the number of deaths from bubonic plague since the outbreak of the epidemic to the present date.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The total number of persons on relief works in India, according to the latest accounts, is 5,802,000. The famine was caused by the failure of last autumn's rains, and has therefore lasted about seven months. It is absolutely impossible at present to form even an approximate estimate of the number of deaths which it has caused directly or indirectly; in some parts of India where famine has been aggravated by cholera and small-pox the mortality, I fear, has been very heavy; in other large districts where the famine is equally severe, but has not been associated with wholesale epidemic disease the efforts of the Government of India and its organisation of relief have been so successful that the death rate is hardly above the normal. The total number of reported plague deaths from 1896, when the epidemic began, down to last April, was 358,685—that is to say, about one death per annum to every three thousand living inhabitants of India. At the present moment the plague mortality in Bombay is lower than at any period in the three preceding years.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Can the noble Lord promise to give us the number of deaths that have occurred from famine?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I hope the hon. Gentleman will recollect that the area covered by famine contains 85,000,000 people, and that the number of Europeans and of officials in that district is very small. He will see that, necessarily, a considerable time must elapse before anything like adequate statistics can be obtained, but I shall accelerate the collecting of information as far as I can, and I shall see that it is published as soon as possible.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to the report of Dr. Kloptsch, administrator of the fund raised in New York for the relief of distress in India, and whether he has any information to the effect, as stated in the report, that vultures, dogs, and jackals have been found devouring human bodies left unburied; and whether in view of the suffering caused by famine and plague throughout India at present, the Government will recommend at once the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the best and speediest method of dealing with the state of affairs now existing in Her Majesty's Indian Empire.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have seen the telegram of Dr. Kloptsch, and have read similar statements in one or two of the numerous reports that have reached me. These statements only apply to the districts, limited in number, I am glad to say, where cholera and small-pox have attacked the famine camps, thus forming a combination which for the moment baffles any administrative palliation. A Commission of great weight and authority was appointed in 1897 to report on the best method of dealing with famine in India, and its suggestions, which were published in 1898 after a most elaborate and searching inquiry, have been of great value. Another similar Commission was appointed in 1898 to deal with the plague, and has produced a very important and exhaustive Report, part of which only has yet been published. I do not, therefore, propose at present to advise the appointment of a Royal Commission, though it may hereafter be advisable when the present epidemics are over to utilise the experience gained by making it the subject of further Reports.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Arising out of that answer, may I ask whether the Government propose to wait until millions of people meet their death by starvation before they will inquire as to a remedy?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I hope the monsoon which has begun will very shortly put an end to the famine. I think the hon. Gentleman will see that it is quite impossible with only a limited number of officials at our disposal to ask them to put on one side the more pressing work of ministering to the wants of the distressed in order to make inquiries and ascertain statistics.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The noble Lord admits that the deaths are so numerous that bodies are unburied and are even being devoured by the dogs. Will he urge on the Government the desirability of raising at once whatever money may be necessary in order to put an end to this scandal and give some relief to the people?

LORD G. HAMILTON: It is not a question of money. The only method by which you can deal with the enormous number of people who are suffering from hunger over great areas is to aggregate them in camps in healthy sites. Unfortunately, in the west of India there has been no rain for the last seven months, and the difficulty is not so much the scarcity of food as the purity of the water. If cholera attacks in its worst form one of the camps, it so terrifies the people that they fly in all directions, carrying with them the germs of disease and dying by the roadsides and in the ditches. And the difficulty does not end there even, because not only does the panic affect the people who are congregated in the camps, but it affects the hospital assistants, camp followers, and camp scavengers. I believe that on more than one occasion the European officer after a panic has found himself with but few assistants in the presence of the dead and dying, all the rest having fled. It is due to such a state of things and not to a lack of money that this mortality arises.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The noble Lord has not said whether it would not be possible by the application of money, by the employment of a sufficient number of assistants——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! This is now becoming a debate. The hon. Member must give notice of any further question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: With great respect, I desire simply to ask a question——

*MR. SPEAKER: I have said that the hon. Member is proceeding to debate the answer given. That is not proper.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Oh, of course not. You spend sixty millions of money on war, and let the people of India die of famine.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has received a memorial from the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce affirming the responsibility of this country for the well-being of the people of India, and urging Her Majesty's Government to at once invite Parliament to vote an Imperial Grant in relief of the Indian famine; and whether he will state what reply has been given to the memorialists.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I received about a month ago a memorial from the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, the purport of which is correctly stated in the hon. Member's question. My reply was to the effect that the Government of India had undertaken to prevent deaths from famine, and to relieve suffering so far as those objects could be attained by the expenditure of money and the administrative machinery at their disposal; that they had been informed that, if their financial resources should prove insufficient to carry out this undertaking, Her Majesty's Government would be ready to give help in whatever form might be thought most advisable, and that, having regard to what the famine had already cost, and might be expected to cost on the one hand, and to the state of the Indian finances on the other, there seemed to be at present no reason to apprehend that such help would be required.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: They are collecting for India in America.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of the Government to vote a sum of money for the relief of the famine-stricken people of India.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not know of any ground at present for initiating the great change of policy suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Although six millions of people are starving!

NATIONAL GALLERY—PRECAUTIONS AGAINST FIRE.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if any steps are proposed in order to isolate the National Gallery in view of the grave danger from fire to which the building is now subject.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he intends to adopt any measures to ensure greater security from fire of the buildings and contents of the National Gallery; and, if so, what measures, and when does he propose to adopt them.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been directed to a fire which took place on 30th May in the corner of the block of buildings in 12, Pall Mall East, adjoining the National Gallery; and whether, seeing that Block B, the south end of St. George's Barracks, forming the canteen, and presumably containing combustible material, absolutely abuts upon the wall of the Great Gallery containing Turner's pictures; that the gable wall of this canteen is only 18 inches thick and has a chimney flue running up it, apparently built into the walls of the National Gallery itself; also that the back windows of the gallery are at right angles to those of the canteen, and, as they are only some six or eight feet from the latter, in the case of the canteen catching fire and the wind blowing from the north, it would be almost impossible to prevent the flames being driven into the windows of the gallery; and also that no precaution could prevent damage to the national collection from flames, sparks, smoke, or heating of the party wall, he will consider the desirability of cutting off the building containing our priceless national collection from the barracks on the one hand and the group of inflammable shops on the other.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The fire which occurred on the 30th May last in premises adjacent to the National Gallery tested the arrangements hitherto made for the protection of the gallery against fire, and the result was in the main satisfactory. In the opinion of Her Majesty's Government the risk at the present time is slight, but in order to reduce it to a minimum, negotiations have been commenced with the owners of the adjacent property with a view to the isolation of the western end of the National Gallery. Should these negotiations fail, which I hope may not be the case, Parliament will be asked in the usual manner to furnish powers to the Government for the immediate acquisition of the property in question. I do not know whether after this the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire requires me to give the answer prepared to his question to the First Lord of the Treasury.

DR. FARQUHARSON: If the right hon. Gentleman has any further information I shall be glad to hear it.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The second paragraph of the question of the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire is apparently taken *en bloc* from the file of the *Daily Graphic* of 6th June, 1895, which I have with me. This statement is out of date and consequently inaccurate. I have already on more than one occasion explained to the hon. Member in the House that Block B of St. George's Barracks is not in actual contact (save by a screen wall) with the wall of the National Gallery; and that the canteen has been removed to the other end of the barracks. The statement with regard to the position of the chimney flue and the gallery windows is not correct—the flue being part of the National Gallery and not of the barracks, and, further, is not in use. The House will recollect that the barracks will be removed as soon as those now in course of construction at Millbank are completed, and further, that the Government last year purchased a large block of property in St. Martin's Street, which has since been cleared.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As a desire has been expressed that the Railway Accidents Bill, as amended, shall be reprinted, it would be inconvenient to take it on Monday, as originally arranged, after the Australian Commonwealth Bill. The Ecclesiastical Assessment (Scotland) Bill will therefore be substituted for the Railway Bill.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the Committee stage of the Australian Commonwealth Bill be taken from day to day until it is finished?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no doubt it will be, if necessary.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. Munro Ferguson (added in respect of the Agricultural Holdings Bill); and had appointed in substitution: Sir William Wedderburn.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SUPPLY [13TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS IV.

1. £5,585,099, to complete the sum for Board of Education.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): It is always difficult, in considering a Vote of this character, to discuss it with any approach to accuracy, when we have not before us, as is the case today, the Report for the past year on Education. I only wish, on this occasion, to say a few words with regard to one or two topics raised by this Vote. The first is as to the position of the teachers. The right hon. Gentleman is well aware that the teachers of this country are the only persons of their class in the world who are subject to arbitrary and capricious dismissal. It is necessary, I think, if we are to have a body of self-respecting men engaged in the great work of education, that they should not be subject to arbitrary and capricious dismissal at the hands of a single individual. As we were informed by the Report of the Royal Commission, in too many cases the whole management of schools—of State supported schools—is practically entirely in the hands of a single individual. It is not a position in which any elementary teacher should be placed that he should be dependent entirely upon the goodwill of one individual for the permanency and security of his position. There is just one other point to which I should like to refer, and that is the question of training colleges. The right hon. Gentleman told us that it was open to Nonconformists to found training colleges, and that the State would be ready to make a grant to them. But we hold it is the business of the State in this country, as it is in every civilised country in the world, to establish these training colleges on its own account. It is perfectly monstrous that Nonconformists, as such, should be asked to establish colleges for the purpose of training teachers who are to teach in our public elementary schools, and it is absolutely unreasonable. Such a demand would not be made in any other civilised country in the world. We ask that the admitted deficiency in the supply of training colleges should be made up by the State, and that men who are inclined to enter into the teaching profession should not be excluded from that profession simply because they do not happen to belong to a denomination which has an ample supply of training colleges. There is a question relating to Wales to which I also wish to ask attention for a few minutes. The right hon. Gentleman the

Vice-President has always treated Wales with great fairness and courtesy, and I wish to ask him now whether the Board of Education have taken any steps in the course of the reorganisation to which they have now set their hands to deal out justice to Wales in the matter of Museum grants. Speaking on the 4th of August last year* the right hon. Gentleman said that Wales would no doubt receive favourable consideration in regard to this matter, and I would again remind him that out of the money which is set apart for this purpose, while Scotland receives £12,000 per year and Ireland £22,000 for their museums, Wales gets absolutely nothing whatever. Scotland and Ireland too get many thousands of pounds for purposes which are slightly outside the Museum grant. While successive Ministers have expressed the utmost sympathy with this desire on the part of Wales for a due and proper share of the Museum grant, nothing practical has yet been done, and I can only hope that the right hon. Gentleman, if he is not in a position to give us a definite promise, will at least not weaken in any respect declarations previously made by Ministers on this subject. In visiting provincial museums on the Continent I have been very much struck to see how far they are in advance of us, and I have almost been ashamed to think that a wealthy country like this should not do more for its provincial museums. The amount which appears on the Vote by way of grant to local museums has, I believe, been increased from £1,000 to £1,500. I venture to say that that is a miserably inadequate sum for an object of this kind. These museums are intended for educational purposes, and in Wales we have done our best in past years to promote such purposes in connection with them. I think we deserve well of the Government for what we have done, and I earnestly appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to give us help in this respect.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I have no intention of retraversing the wide field occupied in the course of this debate, but I wish as a Nonconformist to express my strong dissent from the views of a brother Nonconformist—I refer to the hon. Member for West Fife—who appears to be under an impression which is, I think, shared by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that these religious grievances of which we hear in connection with education are to a considerable extent manufactured grievances: that they are the grievances of agitators. The hon. Member for West Fife pointed out that we hear nothing in this House of complaints by parents themselves, with regard to the character of the religious education to which their children are subjected. Now, the hon. Member is a frequent attendant in this House——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! This question was fully debated yesterday, and a division was taken upon it. I do not think it would be regular to raise the same debate again to-day.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: I am about to refer to the action of the Department in connection with several cases in which children have been compelled to attend Roman Catholic or Church of England schools, contrary to the wishes of their parents. If I am not in order I will not, of course, proceed.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That very point was debated yesterday, and, a division having taken place upon it, I must assume that the debate is closed. I do not think, therefore, it is open to the hon. Member to raise the same point again today, although the same Vote may be under consideration.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: There is one case to which I wish to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, because I believe that very shortly the Department will have to deal with it, if it has not already done so. It is a case at Bolton-cum-Seacombe, where the school board has lately introduced not only the Apostles' Creed, but also a portion of the Church Catechism into the religious teaching in its school. A large number of the parents have undoubtedly shown by their action that they are not indifferent in this matter. On the contrary, they have evinced a most lively interest in it. A vigorous protest has been entered against the action of the board, and I believe that no fewer than 948 have signed returns expressing strong dissent from the course which has been pursued. If the parents of the children attending elementary schools are indifferent to religion so far as they themselves are concerned, it is clear from this that they are not indifferent where their children are affected.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxv., p. 1505.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member is now replying to a speech made yesterday in a former debate, and I do not think he ought to do that. If he wishes to ask a question with regard to any particular case he may fairly do so, but he cannot re-open a debate which occurred yesterday, and upon which a division was taken.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: Very well, Sir. I will conclude by expressing the simple hope that the facts to which I have drawn attention will receive careful attention at the hands of the right hon. Gentleman; because undoubtedly the decision the Department may come to in this case will affect the action of the school authorities in several other places.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): I have a question to ask with regard to a rather small matter of administration. In the Vote now under consideration there are two classes of servants of the Department—senior examiners, of whom there are six, with salaries ranging from £650 to £800, and junior examiners, of whom there are eighteen, with salaries varying from £250 to £600. There is also an assistant examiner, with a salary rising from £250 to £550. I wish to ask what are the special functions of these examiners, and whether they are called examiners by way of giving them a different name, so that they may be nominated instead of being called upon to pass the examination which ordinary Civil Service clerks have to submit themselves to. I understand that the duties of these officers are almost the same as those of the ordinary clerk, and that the name of examiner is simply a title. I believe the Treasury has pressed on several occasions that these offices should be thrown open to competition, instead of being filled up by patronage or nomination, and I should like an explanation why this has not been done, and why this injustice is inflicted upon those who have to pass the examination. No doubt, in a Department of this kind, it may be desirable to have certain offices requiring superior knowledge filled by nomination, but I would venture to suggest that there are already far too many such offices thus filled, with the result that men quite incompetent for the work are enabled to avoid the examination and creep into the service.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Before this debate concludes I wish to add my appeal to that made by the hon. Member for Flint Burghs that something should be done in order to secure teachers against arbitrary dismissal. I am afraid there are a great many cases in which injustice has been done. I know the right hon. Gentleman takes the view that he cannot interfere except in certain specific cases. But surely if there is an abuse—if money voted by Parliament for definite purposes is used by the local authorities in such a way as to create an abuse, then the Department which has in charge the administration of the Act has a right to interfere and to withhold the grant if it is used for improper purposes. I believe that Parliament would back up the right hon. Gentleman in any action he might take in that direction. It is not merely a question of Voluntary schools. I am told that some of the board schools are quite as bad as the Voluntary schools in this respect, and that there is a lot of petty oppression, arising sometimes from personal pique, and at other times from party or sectarian disputes. The only difficulty is in dealing with the manager, whose position is practically paramount and permanent, and who is not responsible to any local authority or to the people of the district. In his case there is no court of appeal, whereas in the case of a school board at the end of three years there is an appeal to the ratepayers of the district, and my experience is that when such an appeal is made the people usually back up the schoolmaster. I trust that, before this debate concludes, the right hon. Gentleman will be able to hold out a hope that something will be done in this direction, seeing that there appears to be a pretty unanimous opinion in the House in favour of administrative action. Then I should like to know whether any general directions have been given with regard to the audit of the accounts of Voluntary schools. I believe that under the Act of 1897 there was provision made for some general supervision over this audit. One case which has been brought under my notice is, I must say, rather extraordinary. I find that in a good many cases the managers of Voluntary schools charge rent in respect of the buildings. I do not think that ought to be, and under the general instructions to auditors the right hon. Gentleman might prevent a thing of that kind happening. What is done is this. A building is erected by an educational trust, and the local managers find that they should like some money for the rebuilding of a church or the payment of an organist, or something of that sort, and they manipulate the accounts in such a way as to be able to get £50, £100, or in some cases even £300, in name of rent. It is really utilised for other purposes—that is to say, we are voting money here for educational purposes which is used with the connivance of the Education Department for totally alien purposes. Surely the right hon. Gentleman could stop this. I will give you a case in point. In this case I do not know what is done with the money. In the town of Eastbourne the school accommodation was not sufficient, and the Education Department interfered and said, "You must increase the accommodation for the children there." What was done? A company was got up—everything is run on limited liability principles in these days, even sectarian schools—and one of the shareholders, I believe, is a gentleman known to the Vice-President of the Council. He is the largest shareholder, having, I believe, 500 shares in this educational sectarian syndicate. There are no voluntary subscriptions at all towards the maintenance of that school, but I find that rent is charged amounting to £117 10s. Out of that £12 10s. is payable to his Grace the Duke of Devonshire in respect of something or other; I do not know what it is. This company pays a dividend. Surely this is the introduction of a novel principle into the educational policy of this country. Would the right hon. Gentleman say that the Education Department would tolerate a thing of that sort in connection with the training colleges? Would he allow Nonconformists to build a training college and pay 3, 4, or 5 per cent. dividend on it out of money voted by Parliament? The Duke of Devonshire gets 3 or 4 per cent. on excellent security—on the money voted by Parliament. Surely 2½ per cent. is enough for his Grace. Besides the interest he gets £12 10s. I do not know what it is—ground rent or what not. It is too trivial a sum to amount to anything in the nature of a scandal, and I am sure the £12 10s. or the interest on the shares is not a material matter to the Duke of Devonshire, but it is a novel principle that £117 10s. voted by Parliament for education goes to a private enterprise. In fact, we are voting money to pay dividends. This is a novel principle which ought not to be tolerated, and I say that the right hon. Gentleman ought to give general instructions as to what is to be allowed and what is not to be allowed in the auditing of these accounts. It is perfectly competent to do so. The section is a vague one, and it is left to the right hon. Gentleman himself. As far as I am able to see there is no Return to show what has been done. I will ask one or two specific questions about this case. I think it is an important one so far as the principle is concerned. I should like to know whether there are any voluntary subscriptions towards this school at all. I am told there are not. I should also like to know with regard to the management of the school whether there is any kind of control. I am told it is managed simply by the syndicate and board of directors under the Companies Acts. If that is so it is an extraordinary case, and a novel case.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): In the case of the school at Eastbourne you have not only a novel case, but something like a scandal. There must be some element of a public nature about the management and constitution of a school to justify the payment of a grant towards that school, but in this case at Eastbourne a precedent has been created and permitted by the Board of Education in the establishment of a public elementary school and a grant-receiving school by a limited liability company. It has among its shareholders the President of the Board of Education. It is a dividend-earning, and perhaps a dividend-paying company. I am not sure whether a dividend has been paid. I submit to the Government that is a position which ought never to have been allowed to exist, and I question if it ever would have been allowed to exist but for the peculiar circumstances of the case and the persons connected with it. I know that the President of the Board of Education is not personally interested. I doubt whether he knows very much about the matter himself. It may be all done by his agent in the locality, but I wish to press upon the notice of the Government that this kind of thing ought not to have been allowed in connection with public elementary education. I hope, now that my hon. friend has drawn attention to the matter, this anomaly, not to say scandal, will cease. There is one matter to which I should like to refer further, because in his second speech last night the Vice-President of the Council did not refer to it himself, although some discussion took place regarding it. It is the question of further facilities for the training of teachers. The view of the Vice-President himself is that there should be an extension of the opportunities afforded by the training colleges, and in that view we all concur. A day training college is not of that cloistered, seminaristic nature which attaches to the other training colleges. The students in a day training college are not wholly separated from other students. They do not all belong to the same class. They intend to follow the same course of instruction, because in professional and technical matters they can specialise. They are in fact students of a university college. A good many excellent day training colleges do exist in the university colleges of this country. There is one in my own district, and one of the most successful of all, in Nottingham. The number of students attending the day training colleges would be larger if the grant to the colleges were more liberal. For some reason which I have been unable to understand a grant of £50 a year is made for a man, and £35 a year for a woman—that is to a residential college. The grant paid to a day training college is less. It is in respect of a man £35 and in respect of a woman £30. Part of that is paid towards the student's maintenance and board, and £10 goes to the college for paying fees and tuition expenses. There is a disparity of £15 in the case of a man and of £5 in the case of a woman. There were last year something less than 1,000 students. There are this year something more than 1,000. I cannot get the exact figures, because the Blue-book is not detailed on this point. I estimate that it will take £10,000 to raise the grant to the day training college students. It will take more than £10,000 as you multiply the students in these colleges. The colleges are petitioning, and I believe the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, directly or indirectly, have asked that this grant shall be made larger. I respectfully urge upon the Vice-President the propriety and almost the necessity of increasing the grants to the day training colleges, so as to enable students who wish to go to these institutions to proceed thither. At present it is easier and cheaper for a student to go to a residential college than to a day training college. The right hon. Gentleman expressed himself in favour of the day training colleges. A simple and obvious method of adding to their usefulness is to grant £10,000 or £15,000 for the purpose. I hope he will not sit down without referring to that point.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I have already gone at considerable length into the question of training colleges, and I have nothing to add. As to the grants to the residential colleges and the day training colleges, I expressed my own personal opinion that they ought to be equalised.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): The right hon. Gentleman did not say in what way he thought they should be equalised. I hope there will be no levelling in the way of bringing the higher contributions down to the point of the lower ones.

MR. YOXALL: Will that be done?

SIR J. GORST: I can assure hon. Members that their arguments and their views will be laid by me before the proper authority—the Board of Education. The practice is really quite unfair that is growing up in this House of speaking to me as though I were a member of the Government, with absolute power to do as I like.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not say that I wish to treat him unfairly. I only wish to know what his proposal will be on behalf of the Board of Education.

SIR J. GORST: Several of these matters were discussed last night, and I have said that in my opinion they deserve very careful consideration. How can I within such a very short time state what decision my noble friend has come to? It is perfectly unreasonable to ask it. The Treasury have to be consulted on the subject; the financial consequences of any reform have to be considered; therefore it is quite impossible to come down to the House the very day after the matter has been brought up and announce the decision of the Government. I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday, and I do not know that any advantage is obtained by raking up again this afternoon matters which were fully discussed yesterday. The same remark applies exactly to the question of the dismissal of teachers. I stated yesterday what my personal opinions were, and that the questions raised would receive most careful consideration. I admitted there was a grievance, and I can say no more in answer to the appeal of the hon. Member for West Nottingham.

MR. YOXALL: I made no appeal on that point. My appeal was with regard to the day training colleges.

SIR J. GORST: I beg the hon. Member's pardon; it was the hon. Member for Flint who raised the point. With regard to the question of a Welsh museum, I have often expressed the regret of the Department that it is impossible to establish a central museum in Wales until we know what the capital of Wales is. That we have never been able to ascertain. But I think hon. Members who advocate this proposal are getting a little out of date, because the whole trend of the policy of the Board of Education is to have one great central museum in the Victoria and Albert Museum at South Kensington, and from that museum to send collections—very important and valuable collections, which are from time to time exchanged—to various provincial museums. We have now nothing whatever to do with Edinburgh or Dublin—they are quite separated from our Department; we have now only one central museum for which we are responsible—namely, the Victoria and Albert Museum. I can only say that within recent years enormous progress has been made there, both in the number and in the character of the collections which are sent to provincial museums. For instance, there are now no fewer than three collections of extremely beautiful water-colours which give examples of the whole history of water-colour art in this country. These collections are continually being sent about the country from place to place, and I believe Wales has had its full share of those collections. There are other collections arranged from time to time in regard to which local authorities are consulted; collections are sent which contain the objects the local authorities consider most useful to the educational requirements of the neighbourhood. I feel myself quite certain that it is by far the better policy for the diffusion of interest in art to have a great central museum such as we have in the Victoria and Albert Museum — a museum which has no rival in any part of the world. That museum is of its kind quite unique, and it is extraordinary that, while the people of this country perhaps scarcely understand its value, foreigners from all parts of Europe come to see it, and they all admit that there is nothing of its kind to be found in any foreign country in the world. That museum is not a museum appropriated to the people of London; it is a museum which forms the nucleus of a great number of collections which are continually being sent about the country, by that means diffusing a knowledge of and an acquaintance with art in a manner which is perfectly extraordinary. That, I think, is a policy to which it is far better the finances of the country should be directed than the establishment of provincial museums, which, if established at all, should be established by the people of the locality. It is certainly much better that there should be this circulation from a great central museum. The question of the examiners has been raised, and I have been asked why they are called "examiners." There is nothing more difficult than to find out why certain names are given to certain people. I do not know why I am called "the Vice-President," nor do I know why an examiner is called "an examiner," or a clerk "a clerk." But these officials exercise most important functions in the Board of Education. They are the officials who receive and deal with the enormous correspondence which is carried on by the Board of Education with various schools, inspectors, teachers, and so on all over the kingdom. They are divided into two classes, "Senior" and Junior," because it is thought that after a man has served the country for a certain length of time he deserves promotion, and the two classes are made in order to mark the advance of a man in the service of the country. The examiners are most useful officials, without whom the work could not possibly be carried out. I am asked why they are not admitted by competitive examination. That question has never arisen in my time. The hon. Member said that constant representations had been made by the Treasury to the Education Department that they ought to be selected by competitive examination. All I can say is that no such representations have ever been made in my day, and therefore I have not had occasion to consider the subject, and I am not prepared off hand, without any notice, to say why it has been thought desirable in former years by succeeding Governments to have these officers nominated instead of selected by competitive examination as are the officials in some Departments. If the hon. Member had given me notice of his intention of asking this question I would have tried to put myself in a better position to answer. It is a practice which has existed ever since the Board of Education was constituted, it has been approved by successive Governments, and I have had too many things to think of since I have been at the Education Department to trouble myself with considering questions which nobody else has raised. The hon. Member for Carnarvon is very much exercised as to the payment of rent for schools. A reasonable and proper amount of rent is an expenditure without which it is impossible that education can be carried on. You must have a building, and if you do not possess one you must hire. Rent is constantly paid by school boards, voluntary associations, and managers of schools all over the country, and as long as the amount of rent is reasonable and moderate it is an entirely proper expenditure for the purposes of education. It is quite true there have been a good many scandals connected with the matter from time to time, and I am sorry to say that some of the worst offenders have been not Churchmen, but Nonconformists. Rent has been charged for chapels and so on which has been quite unreasonable and improper. I think, however, that that is only a matter of past history, and that at the present day, under existing arrangements at all events, no such improper charges are made.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER: I think the motive for charging those rents has disappeared.

Sir J. GORST: Since the abolition of the 17s. 6d. limit there is no object in making that kind of fictitious charge. The hon. Member then asked me a very proper question with regard to the audit of school accounts. In 1897 it was made compulsory on all schools receiving the Aid Grant, and by an article in the Code of the same year the Department made it compulsory on all Voluntary schools, that the accounts should be audited. Those accounts have to be audited by a banker or a professional accountant.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Who selects the auditor?

Sir J. GORST: The auditor is selected by the school itself. That auditor has to be either a banker or a professional accountant, or, if they cannot obtain such an auditor, they may apply to the Education Department for permission to appoint someone else, and in a few cases persons such as agents, auctioneers, and people of that kind have been sanctioned. But the audit is now in every case a very real and proper audit. The hon. Member seems to think that the Education Department might select the auditors. That would be an enormous task, and one which the Department could not possibly perform. It would be impossible all over the country to pick out men to audit the accounts of village schools, which are frequently extremely simple and short and really do not require so important a person as a district or Local Government Board auditor or any such public official. I think I have now answered all the questions which have been asked——

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: What about Eastbourne?

Sir J. GORST: The hon. Member not having given me any notice of his intention to ask questions about Eastbourne, I have not provided myself with the information necessary to answer him. I cannot tell him whether or not there are any voluntary subscriptions there, nor can I tell him what arrangements are made for the management of the school. It is quite true the building was constructed by a limited liability company, which receives from the school managers a reasonable and moderate rent for its use, and that rent enables the shareholders of the company to receive a very moderate dividend. That is really the way in which the school was built, when there was no other means by which it could be done. If the hon. Member will propose to build a training college in the same manner and on the same principles, I can assure him the Board of Education will welcome any such efforts, and that every assistance and encouragement shall be given to provide training colleges on similar terms.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: There is just one question I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman. In the higher grade schools about to be established I understand that a grant of about £6 per head will be received from the Government. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to bear in mind that we in Wales are doing the work of these higher grade schools. We rate ourselves, and while it is true that we receive a Treasury grant, that grant amounts to only £2 per head. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will help us to carry out the admirable suggestions made in his excellent speech yesterday with regard to the training of teachers. We are doing our best in the different counties of Wales to induce managers of schools, both Board and Voluntary, to send their pupil teachers to the secondary schools. The difficulty in the way is, of course, financial, and I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to promise that, as we are doing this work —work of which I know he thoroughly approves—and as we receive only one-third as much with respect of each scholar as will be received in England, our case in regard to help for pupil teachers should be sympathetically considered by him. I will say only one word with regard to the musuem question. Our claim for this museum and art gallery stands entirely apart from the educational museum to which he has referred, and his remarks do not apply to that.

*LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I was very pleased to hear what the Vice-President of the Council said in regard to the circulation of art objects. Very great progress has been made at the museum within the past fifteen or eighteen months, and I hope the Vice-President will continue to urge forward that system as much as he possibly can. At the same time I hope he will not carry that system too far, and that he will not carry out the principle of decentralisation as much as he indicated in his speech. He said that the Victoria and Albert Museum was not appropriated for the purposes of London alone, but that it is a national and not a metropolitan museum. We must remember that we are spending an enormous sum of money upon this building, and we are not erecting this enormous building merely as a dépôt or warehouse for objects exclusively for the provinces. I think a great deal has been done latterly to improve the whole condition of things, and there is really only one point with regard to the organisation of that Department to which I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, and that is the absolute necessity of having trained and expert officials among the staff upon whom the duty of buying objects of art devolves. There have been famous scandals in the past about what they have done. They have made extraordinary purchases under extraordinary misapprehensions, and some of the purchases are mentioned in the famous Minute which is a masterpiece of bluff and casuistry quite worthy of the traditions of its illustrious author. There was some doubt as to whether one object was a Tudor piece of work or a piece of work made in Ceylon in the last century. If the right hon. Gentleman will use his influence to secure a better training for those who have to buy these objects for the museum such ludicrous mistakes as those which have been made in the past will be impossible in the future. At the present time an effort is being made to limit the employment of officials at this museum to one particular department. At present the right hon. Gentleman cannot guarantee that when a man is placed in one department he shall stay there. The result is that this man is master of no subject, and as a rule, I am afraid, he is inefficient in most subjects. That is not the fault of the official, if he is constantly moved from one department to another. If the right hon. Gentleman would have separate and distinct departments governed under regular rules and not under the capricious system by which the museum is divided into departments, he would secure a far more highly efficient staff than under present conditions it is possible for him to expect. We are going to build this great museum, and judging from the plans, it will be one of the finest in the world. Here is a splendid opportunity to make this museum a model of classification. The museum at Dublin, which, up to a short time ago, was under the Science and Art Department, is one of the best classified museums in Europe, and there is no reason why this Victoria and Albert Museum should not be as good as the Dublin Museum. In conclusion there is one question which I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman, and that is, if he can say when the Report of the Departmental Committee, which has now finished its investigations, is likely to be issued to the public. The Report is of the most vital interest to all who have studied the question of museums, and I hope the publication of this document will not be much longer delayed.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I wish to allude to the appointment of auditors. In many cases the schools are entirely in the hands of the local clergyman. Here is public money being spent, and the clergyman is left to select his own auditor. This is public money, and there ought to be a public auditor. The right hon. Gentleman told us that if we would start a limited liability company to build a training school the Government would accept it, and take on lease the buildings we erect. My hon. friend beside me cited a case—which the Vice-President of the Council approved of—at Eastbourne, where the dividend was paid out of the public grant to a public company. I want to know what is the agreement which the right hon. Gentleman suggests. Is he prepared, if my hon. friends and myself subscribe the capital, or induce others to do so, for these buildings, to give us a repairing lease and pay 3 per cent. interest? That is very good interest from the Government, and I am perfectly certain we should find the capital. These institutions would be built, and the Government would get the benefit of these colleges, and the subscribers would get 3 per cent. interest. Will the right hon. Gentleman give us a specific undertaking to that effect, for as business men we want to know this. It is all very well to answer in this vague way and say that we ought to subscribe the money. We will underwrite it if he likes without any charge, if we have a distinct understanding from the right hon. Gentleman that we shall get 3 per cent. interest on a good repairing lease for fifty years. The right hon. Gentleman can appoint his own auditor. What we require is an understanding that the Government will take our buildings over on a repairing lease, giving us a clear 3 per cent. interest.

*SIR JOHN BRUNNER: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the power of the Board of Education to make proposals regulating the grant to elementary schools is limited to the annual occasion of the presentation of the Code. I understand that it is not presented to the House under any statute, but by Her Majesty's command. It appears to me, therefore, that there is no necessity whatever for the Board of Education to wait till next year to make a proposal to Parliament with regard to the dismissal of teachers. I would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether such a proposal could not be made immediately without waiting until next year. There is also another point which I wish to raise. I take it that whenever managers of a Board school or a denominational school give to the Department a reason for the dismissal of a teacher that reason would invariably be communicated to the teacher accused.

SIR J. GORST: The Board of Education can make a distribution of the Parliamentary grant whenever it likes. The Minute will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it is made. If any financial question is concerned the Board of Education have to obtain the sanction of the Treasury.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer my question about the dismissal of teachers?

SIR J. GORST: I do not wish to pledge myself upon this question, but I may say that the question of giving a dismissed teacher in all cases the reasons for dismissal is being considered by the Lord President of the Council.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: I might be permitted to point out that if the reasons were given it would only be in accordance with precedent. At the present time, in the case of the medical officer or a relieving officer being dismissed, the reason for his dismissal is always communicated by the Department to the official concerned, and I hope this practice will be followed in the case of the teachers.

*MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) desired to obtain from the right hon. Member the Vice-President of the Council an expression of opinion on the matter of specialised training colleges. He was himself satisfied that the reason for there being some difficulty in obtaining suitable teaching staff for the several kinds of elementary schools in town and country, was that these colleges were all run on similar lines as regarded curriculum. The requirements of teachers in regard to the subject matter with which they should be familiar varied in accordance with the position they sought in town and country. The curriculum should vary to meet this; just as high a training being required for the one position as the other, only in a different direction. It might be the best policy to sever that part of the present college course which bore upon secondary education from that which was directed to the training of the teacher as such; even to the extent of requiring a would be teacher to deal with secondary work elsewhere, and prior to his coming to college. At the present time only one-third of the student's time in college is given to the study of methods of teaching and experimental teaching under professors of the art, though it is for this alone these colleges nominally exist. We want more of the training of the teacher in teaching, and less of the secondary school work in the college. If, however, secondary school work is to be carried on in the college, it was obvious some colleges must be found to take up the subjects required by the rural teacher. He was led to make these few remarks at a late hour in the discussion because he had just received a communication from which it appeared that a training college with such a curriculum specialised for rural teachers might be started in 1902, provided the Board of Education would recognise the experiment. He would ask, what were the possibilities of such recognition?

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: I wish to refer to only one point, namely, the payment out of public funds of the rent of Voluntary schools. It involves this anomaly. At present the proprietors of Voluntary schools claim the right of management on the ground that they have erected the buildings, and they then proceed to charge a rent for them. It seems to me, if rent is paid out of public money for these buildings that they are no longer strictly private property, and that the right of management becomes at least disputable.

SIR J. GORST: With reference to the remarks of my hon. friend the Member for the Woodstock Division, I have already expressed myself as favourable to the idea of special training for rural teachers, and if any training college makes a proposal to the Board of Education to have a special curriculum for rural teachers, I am quite certain the question will be considered.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I did not understand the Vice-President to make any reply to the representations of my hon. friend the Member for the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool with reference to the loss which will be inflicted on certain schools in Liverpool by the Block Grant. I should like to ask whether any consideration is to be given to these schools, and whether the Vice-President will consider the local situation which has arisen.

SIR J. GORST: I cannot hold out any prospect of the scheme being now altered, but the case of the Liverpool schools shall be very carefully watched. On a former occasion I pointed out that the School Board of Liverpool could very easily make good any loss sustained, by a very small fractional rate. With regard to the Voluntary schools in Liverpool, no doubt the new Block Grant will be a great gain to Voluntary schools generally, and the number of schools now receiving subsidies from the Special Aid Grant will also be very much benefited, and they might very well spare a part of their gain to make good the loss from which a few schools will suffer. I have now the figures relating to the Eastbourne school. The rent is £76, and the voluntary contributions for maintenance £290.

Vote agreed to.

2. £86,280, to complete the sum for British Museum.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.), who stood at the Table, said: I presume there is no objection to my enjoying the luxury once in a way of speaking from this position, especially as the legitimate Opposition appear to be taking a holiday. I desire to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he would be good enough to explain to the Committee, and especially to the Irish Members, the position which the question of the Irish gold ornaments now in the British Museum occupies. I do not think there is any necessity to go into the history of the circumstances connected with these ornaments, but I may say, for the benefit of hon. Members not acquainted with the question, that some years ago a very valuable discovery was made in the north of Ireland of certain antique Irish gold ornaments of great value in themselves and of much greater value because of their historic interest. These ornaments were discovered by quite a poor man, and he sold them, as I understand, to a Mr. Day, who re-sold them to the trustees of the British Museum for a sum of £600 or thereabouts. The noble Lord the Member for Chorley Division of Lancashire stated quite truly that there is in Dublin a museum which, in some respects, is one of the best in the world, and especially with regard to ancient Irish objects the museum is most perfect. It is felt not only by the authorities of the museum in Dublin, but by all classes of the Irish public, that the proper place for these ornaments would be in that museum, for several reasons. In the first place, these ornaments are of great interest to the people of Ireland, who will have no opportunity of seeing them if they are to remain in the British Museum, and, in the second place, the museum in Dublin contains the most perfect collection of Irish ornaments in the world, and therefore we consider it would be most suitable if the latest find were also deposited there. When this question was brought before the House of Commons by me some years ago it was received with the utmost sympathy by hon. Members of all parties, and the First Lord of the Treasury expressed the greatest sympathy with the desire of the Irish Members to have these ornaments deposited in the Dublin Museum. Other members of the Government, the Members for Trinity College, or, at any rate, one of them, and various representatives from Ireland, also expressed a similar view. Then we were told that the British Museum had no power to part with anything it possessed. I introduced a small Bill for the simple purpose of giving the trustees of the British Museum power to transfer these ornaments to the museum in Dublin, but, directly there was a prospect of the Bill getting through, the trustees changed their ground and made it perfectly clear that they did not intend to part with these ornaments, notwithstanding the strong feeling expressed in the House of Commons that they ought to be deposited in the Dublin Museum. Then the Government appointed a small Committee to inquire into all the circumstances of the case. I was not a member of that Committee, but my hon. friend the Member for West Kerry was, and the result of that inquiry was that, if at all possible, these ornaments should be restored to Ireland, and the Committee laid down the principle that similar finds should, as far as possible, be deposited in the Dublin Museum. How does the case stand now? I am informed that the Law Officers both of Ireland and England have expressed the opinion that the British Museum has no right to the custody of these ornaments, for the simple reason that they are really in the nature of treasure trove, that there was no right to sell them, and that the whole transaction was illegal and unwarrantable. That is the position at the present time. These ornaments, having been found in Ireland, naturally belong to the Dublin Museum. The First Lord of the Treasury is in favour of having them restored; the Committee appointed by the Government have practically reported in favour of their restoration; and the Law Officers of both Ireland and England have given the opinion that the trustees of the British Museum have no right to them and that they were illegally acquired. In face of all these circumstances, I ask, is it not unreasonable and unwarrantable that the trustees of the British Museum should set themselves up against the Report of the Committee, against the opinion of the First Lord of the Treasury and the Law Officers for both Ireland and England, and the universal sentiment expressed in this House? The Secretary to the Treasury will correct me if I have misstated the case, but I do not think I have. No one had a right to sell these ornaments; they are illegally in the possession of the British Museum, and what action is to be taken? I am told that the British Museum authorities take up the position that they do not care a snap about the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, and I ask the Secretary to the Treasury, if the facts be as I have stated them, what action does the Government propose in order to enforce the opinion of its own Law Officers. If it be necessary to introduce a Bill to restore these ornaments to Ireland and the Dublin Museum, will the Government introduce such a Bill, or support a Bill if I or any other Irish Member introduce it? And if they will not proceed by way of legislation in this House, I ask the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, who, as I have stated, is in sympathy with the Irish Members in regard to this question—— [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR at this point entered the House.] I am rather sorry that the right hon. Gentleman was not here during the brief statement I have made; but it is unnecessary for me to do more than to remind him that the Committee which he appointed reported practically in favour of the restoration of the ornaments to Ireland. It is unnecessary for me to mention that the Law Officers of the Crown reported that these ornaments were treasure trove, and that no one had any right to sell them to the British Museum. I was just asking what steps the Government intend to take to enforce the opinion of their own Law Officers and restore these illegally obtained ornaments to Ireland and the Dublin Museum. I understand that the authorities of the British Museum have said that they are not satisfied with the mere opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, but want the case to be decided by a court of law. What means have we of obtaining the opinion of a court of law, and what action are we to take to enforce the opinion of the Law Officers of the right hon. Gentleman's own Government, and to secure that these ornaments, which have been taken in an illegal manner by the British Museum, should be restored to Ireland and placed in the Dublin Museum? Some people may say that this is a small matter, but the Irish Members of every shade of opinion most earnestly desire to have these ornaments, so as to complete the very fine collection of Irish antiquities in Dublin. Certainly the First Lord of the Treasury cannot accuse us of any want of patience in this matter, and I confidently appeal to him now to give us some hope that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown will be enforced, and that these ornaments, after their long and adventurous career in this country and in Ireland, from the time that they were found, may be at length deposited in the museum at Dublin, where all such similar ornaments are now held in national trust and placed on view.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I wish to add my congratulations to the hon. Gentleman on his accession to the position at that box, which has been deserted by the Leader of the Opposition. I think his appearance at the box does him credit, and he bemeans himself with that dignity which we find on all front benches.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: You may be there yourself some day.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: That's as may be. I would ask the hon. Gentleman to be content with something like a compromise. There is a Vote of £600 for autotype copies. Cannot the hon. Member do with an autotype copy?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: No, no! From the very outset of the controversy the authorities of the British Museum offered to give us facsimile imitations of these ornaments, but such an idea was scoffed at. We say, "Let the originals be deposited in the Dublin Museum; the facsimiles will do very well for the British Museum."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The original claim seems to be a very good one. This Vote is levied from the United Kingdom, and when ornaments, works of art, or whatever they may be, are purchased, they ought to be placed in the most appropriate part of the United Kingdom, and the appropriate part in this case is Dublin. As to the question of law, it is said that the British Museum cannot part with these things without an Act of Parliament. I believe the same is said about old newspapers. I am informed that in a few years time no human being will be able to move about in the British Museum for these old newspapers, and the trustees have been compelled to introduce a Bill into Parliament to enable them to burn the old copies of *Truth.* There is a difficulty, but it may be got over. The British Museum can surely part with these gems on payment. [AN HON. MEMBER: No, no!] Is it pretended that the British Museum cannot sell anything? There is, however, another way out of the difficulty; it might buy the gems from itself. It has a grant of £5,800; and no questions would be asked if it paid out of that grant £600 for the gems, buying them from itself. Having recouped itself for what they had paid for the gems, let the British Museum present them to Dublin. I think it is a mean thing that we should hold on by these Irish gems, the proper place for which is undoubtedly Dublin. If it be true that the sale of the gems to the British Museum is illegal, being treasure trove, the British Museum is in the position of being a receiver of stolen goods; and that is not a position in which the trustees of that great national institution should stand. I cannot believe that any legal difficulty exists, and therefore I do trust that Her Majesty's Government will be able to find some means of restoring these gems to Ireland, to which they properly belong.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): It seems convenient for me to deal with this question without delay. The hon. Gentleman who opened this discussion stated, with perfect truth, that there is a very strong feeling in Ireland upon this subject which is not confined to one section or one class of the population. The hon. Gentleman was also perfectly accurate in saying that the matter has now hung on from month to month and from year to year, and is not even at this late hour finally settled. Some hon. Gentlemen seem to be under the impression that the obstacle in the way of the British Museum restoring these gold ornaments to Ireland or to Dublin is a legal disability under which the museum finds itself of getting rid of any property which it has acquired. That legal disability is complete as regards anything which has lawfully come into the possession of the museum, and it would require nothing less than an Act of Parliament to compel the British Museum to give up anything of which it was the lawful possessor, however strong the reason of policy or justice might be which might induce such giving up or such destruction, as in the case of the newspapers to which my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn referred. But, as I understand, that legal disability does not arise in this case. The Law Officers both of England and Ireland have had the case submitted to them and have come to the conclusion that these ornaments were treasure trove and belonged to the Crown, and that the person who found the ornaments, not being the legal possessor of them, had therefore no right to transfer them to the British Museum for payment, to sell them in fact, and consequently the museum is not now the legal owner of them. There is clearly no difficulty in the way of the museum restoring property which is not its own to those to whom it belongs. But the museum, as I understand the matter, is not prepared to accept the verdict of the Law Officers of either England or Ireland. I do not know what has induced the trustees to throw doubt upon such high legal authorities. I do not criticise their action, and certainly I do not mean to justify it. It is not my province to adopt the *rôle* either of critic or defender of the trustees, but I am disposed to think that as they constantly appeal to the Law Officers for advice in legal matters, they might trust their decision in this case, even though it is not agreeable to them. If there is no other way of settling the matter, I presume an appeal will have to be made to the courts of law, but that would be a course which I would greatly regret. The hon. Gentleman opposite asked, if the trustees of the British Museum maintain the attitude they have taken, what facilities he or his friends had for bringing an action. I do not think it ought to be left to private individuals to do that. I think that the Government must take on themselves the responsibility of asking a court of law to give a decision on the point, provided there be no other means of coming to a satisfactory conclusion of the matter. It is quite evident that we cannot acquiesce in the continuance of the present state of things. The Law Officers have informed the Government that the trustees of the British Museum are in the wrong, and I express the earnest hope that they will see their way to retire from a position which I believe is wholly untenable, without arousing that friction and unpleasantness which cannot be disassociated from even a friendly action taken in the law courts.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to express the gratitude which I and the other Irish Members feel at the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has taken in this matter. The reply which he has given will be received with great satisfaction throughout Ireland.

LORD BALCARRES said he only wished to point out that the Royal Irish Academy had shown great supineness in this matter. They knew for months that these articles had been found, and that they had been publicly exhibited in London, but they never moved. They were a public body receiving large sums from the British Treasury, and it was their duty to watch over treasure trove. They had a perfect legal remedy in their hands, and a right to take action against the finder. He was opposed to the transfer of these things which the hon. Member for King's Lynn called gems, although they were gold collars, etc., as the trustees of the British Museum were backed by the opinion of the Lord Chancellor, and did not accept that of the Law Officers of the Crown. Hon. Members opposite had a magnificent museum in Dublin. It was a case for generosity on the part of Ireland more than on the part of England. These articles were of far greater value to science and art in London than in Dublin. There was only one single object in this find of which specimens of three and four times the value did not exist in Dublin. As the specimens were treasure trove, no doubt they would be taken out of the British Museum and transferred to Dublin, and many people would greatly regret the transfer. But there was another question which arose —a question of principle quite apart from treasure trove—and that was whether local interests were to take precedence of national interests in these matters. In his opinion, in the British Museum everything British should be represented, and the Royal Irish Academy which had displayed the most extraordinary apathy in this matter, might at least compromise with the British Museum to the extent of leaving them one or more specimens.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he did not desire to go further into the matter, although the noble Lord opposite had made some rather curious remarks. The noble Lord was closely connected with one of the trustees of the British Museum, and the Committee had listened to a speech delivered ostensibly by the noble Lord, but really by the trustee. Was there really anything in this contention that, because the collection of antique Celtic ornaments existing in Dublin was a fine one, it should not be strengthened by the latest finds? One complete collection in Dublin would be much better than partial collections in different places. Supposing there was a great find of antique objects of extraordinary interest to this country and they were transferred to the Dublin Museum, what would be the result? The idea was preposterous. As regarded the charge of apathy brought against the Royal Irish Academy, it never occurred to them that these ornaments would be sold to the British Museum, or, if they were, that the trustees would refuse to restore to Ireland objects discovered in Ireland, and naturally of most interest to the Irish people. He thought it would only be a graceful act to restore them.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry) asked where this system of restitution was to end. Was the British Museum to be pledged to restore the objects we had got from Athens to Athens, and those which we had got from Egypt to Egypt? For the sake of all who were interested in archæology, these antiquities ought to be in the British Museum. He hoped that if it ever came to a question in the House of Commons, an opportunity would be given of showing by vote whether Members believed that the British Museum ought to be forced to give up what was now in its possession—and of infinite value to the public in its possession—and hand it over to Ireland.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It does not belong to them.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON said the collection was in the British Museum. If —as was contended—it belonged to the Crown, the Crown ought to give it to the British Museum.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the question had been so narrowed down that it became a mere question of whether the British Museum was in possession of property which had been stolen or not. If the Lord Chancellor accepted the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown and decided that this property belonged to the Crown, he thought the Crown would be showing an ungenerous spirit not to give it back to Ireland. But inasmuch as a legal decision in the matter must be arrived at by the Lord Chancellor and the Law Officers of the Crown before anything could be done, the Committee could do nothing more in the matter at present.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) was of opinion that the ornaments in question were either treasure trove or property which had been properly acquired by the British Museum. If they had been properly acquired then the British Museum had a right to keep them. If they were treasure trove they could dispose of them or not as they thought fit. It was ungenerous to a degree to suggest that these ornaments should be transferred to Dublin Museum, which already had a unique collection. He protested against the notion that because these were Irish works of art they should be all kept in Dublin. If Dublin had no specimens, or the specimens which they possessed were poor, by all means let them have the best; but the Dublin collection was a better collection than all these things put together, and it seemed to him that we certainly ought to have a collection like this in London. It was to him a most extraordinary thing for the First Lord of the Treasury to make the offer which he had made. If these ornaments were the property of the Crown, the proper thing to say would be that a fair selection of them should be deposited in London. If once the suggestion of distributing these things among the places from which they came were acted upon, the British Museum would cease to exist. By all means let Ireland have the best collection, but let also a fair collection remain in England. He did not think it would be fair to allow the whole of these ornaments to be sent to Dublin.

*MR. LECKY (Dublin University) said he believed there was no subject on which Irish archæological opinion had felt more strongly than this. The Academy in Dublin was a great centre to which from all over the world people went to study Irish antiquities. It was evident that there had been some neglect in Ireland, otherwise the objects in question would never have gone to the British Museum, but seeing that the Law Officers of the Crown thought that the British Museum had no right to keep them and that the feeling in Ireland was against it, he most sincerely hoped that the British Museum would take the advice of the First Lord of the Treasury and give them up.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Now may I bring to the attention of the Committee another item. It is a question of account. I find in this Vote an item of £5,800, a grant-in-aid. I do not quarrel with the amount of the grant or the application of it, and I do not think, having regard to the importance of it, that it is excessive. But I think the expenditure of the £5,800 should be left to the British Museum, and no surrender should be made of any balance which is left, because if the British Museum were allowed to retain it they might be able to purchase objects of art which they could not otherwise hope to obtain. Neither do I comprehend the necessity of the grant being audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General. I say you have no right to audit these accounts. No one is a greater scrupler than I am for auditing, but it is ridiculous to have these accounts audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General. Nevertheless if the Committee will look at the bottom of page 368 they will see that the expenditure out of the grant-in-aid is subject to the audit of the Comptroller and Auditor General, but there is to be no surrendering of the money. If you are not going to surrender anything what is the use of the audit? I should like an answer to that question. It is absurd when you vote a large sum to the British Museum that it should be an out-and-out grant, and that there should be no power to compel any redistribution of the money, nor any return to the Treasury if nothing has been done of the unexpended balances. In that case why should you go on having the accounts audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General ?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): What really happens in regard to this Vote is this. Up to 1896 if the money was not expended the balance had to be returned to the Treasury. The result was not to induce the trustees of the British Museum to save a large sum, but to fritter away the money on things that might turn out to be not of sufficient value or importance. That being so, the system was altered, and now they receive grants in-aid, but they are not required to return any of the unexpended money. The balance which has not been used can be devoted to the purpose in succeeding years. That being so, the Comptroller and Auditor General is called in because his audit enables Parliament to retain some control over the expenditure, and, in fact, to see how the money has been spent. It is simply by acting in that way that the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons has some check upon the expenditure.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): This point has arisen with regard to the National Portrait Gallery, of which I am a trustee. Previous to 1896 the object of the British Museum and the National Portrait Gallery was to try to use the money voted each year as wisely as they could. The system was altered in that year with excellent results. The matter was gone into by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and it was recognised to be absolutely necessary that the Treasury should have some knowledge of what the balances were when carried forward. It is rather astonishing to hear my hon. friend objecting to the Comptroller and Auditor General being brought in.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The noble Lord has entirely misapprehended my position. I am an advocate of giving a lump sum. I approve of that. The noble Lord says the Treasury knows what is being done. I do not care twopence what the Treasury knows. The Comptroller and Auditor General is an independent officer of this House, and he is a person whose interference is wholly unnecessary after you have settled the principle of giving an out-and-out grant either to the British Museum or the National Portrait Gallery.

*SIR F. S. POWELL (Wigan): Will you allow me to say that when we had the inquiry about the South Kensington Museum, exactly the same question arose ? We carefully investigated the whole subject, and came to the conclusion that the regulations which have been made in regard to the grant are thoroughly sound and wise. Under the new system we are not compelled to spend the whole of the money in the same year. At the same time, I think Parliament ought to exercise some control of a general character in the way of supervising the expenditure. That provision is made by means of the audit, and I believe it is carried out in a wise and sound manner.

Vote agreed to.

3. £8,374, to complete the sum for National Gallery.

4. £2,520, to complete the sum for National Portrait Gallery.

5. £4,967, to complete the sum for Wallace Collection.

6. £35,724, to complete the sum for Scientific Investigation, etc.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I wish to call attention to the grant-in-aid of £1,000 to the Marine Biological Association. I do not complain of this grant; on the contrary, what I desire to advocate is that the grant to this association, which, to put it in a popular form, is an association for the study of the habits of sea fish, should be very largely increased with the view to the better study of sea-fish life. The ignorance of sea-fish life in this country is almost incredible, and hence we have presumptuous Presidents of the Board of Trade introducing nefarious Bills to regulate the size of fish that are to be sold. Nobody can tell why fish are here one year and away the next. We ought to do in this country what the United States have done, and erect a permanent institution for the study of the habits of sea-fish life. That is done to a very large extent in the United

States. Tens of thousands of pounds are spent every year, and the result has been the accumulation of a large amount of useful knowledge. We can do little with this miserable contribution of £1,000 to a semi-private association. They have an establishment at Plymouth. They keep a kind of show or aquarium to which the public are admitted, and they prosecute to a very small extent, but I believe with great energy and ability, the investigation of the habits of fish. It is in consequence of the ignorance prevailing in this country on the subject that you have to measure and say the size of fish that may be sold. It is absurd to say that we know enough of the sole, or any other fish, to indicate the number of inches they ought to be before being sold. I have been a sufferer from the ignorance of Presidents of the Board of Trade in connection with a measure which I have hitherto successfully resisted. The right hon. Gentleman may be able to pass it over my head this year. I feel that some stand ought to be made against the dark ignorance that prevails on this subject, especially upon the Treasury Bench. There is only one way of becoming acquainted with the habits of sea fish, and that is by studying them. This is a good beginning. This society is a good society. They have published some very remarkable pamphlets, characterised by so ripe judgment that I have been able to quote their remarks against the Undersized Fish Bill. If that is so, do not be content with giving them a beggarly £1,000. In this marine fish inquiry launch out with a generous hand, so that a larger number of scientific men may engage in the investigation of the habits of sea fish. Have a certain number of vessels engaged in trawling in the sea in pursuit of knowledge of that kind, and then you will be in a position, which I hold you are not in now, to propose legislation which will be useful to fishermen and to the community generally. I wish to ask whether the Treasury intend to proceed on this entirely inadequate system of making a very small contribution to a small semi-private society of £1,000 a year, or whether they are prepared to consider the extremely important nature of the problems involved in the acquisition of a knowledge of fish, and also whether they are prepared to entertain the idea of setting up an establishment like that in the United States, which will enable them to get a fuller and more accurate knowledge of the habits of sea fish.

LORD BALCARRES: The Vote includes a sum of £7,000 as a grant in aid of the cost of building and equipping the National Physical Laboratory. The Secretary of the Treasury has promised to receive a deputation representing those who believe that a more suitable site than that selected for the buildings could be found. I should like an assurance from my right hon. friend that the voting of this sum of £7,000 does not in any way bind him or the Treasury to adhere to the site that is proposed, and that if the deputation can persuade him that a more suitable site could be found elsewhere, he will not be prevented by this from accepting their view. We do not wish to be met with the answer that the money has been voted and nothing can be done. I might appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury to continue some grant-in-aid, if only for a reduced amount, to the British School at Athens. It is a most interesting work that is being done, and I think there are many people in this country who will show warm sympathy with the right hon. Gentleman if he should be successful in continuing this grant.

MR. HANBURY: With regard to the question raised by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, I think he is under some misapprehension when he supposes that this is the only grant-in-aid for scientific purposes. As a matter of fact we give a grant to the Scottish Fishery Board for the purpose of scientific investigation, and similar assistance is given to the Irish fisheries. I am not aware whether any further sum is given for scientific investigation in England. The association has already a larger income than it spends, and under present conditions there does not seem to be any urgent necessity to increase the grant of £1,000 a year. In regard to the Physical Laboratory, which has been referred to by my noble friend behind me, the Treasury, after all, have had very little voice in the matter. We acted entirely on the recommendation of the Committee of the Royal Society. It was absolutely necessary to find a spot near Kew Observatory, where this laboratory is proposed to be situated. After looking at every possible site, they reported that no other site would answer the purpose so well as this one which adjoins Kew Gardens. I quite agree with my noble friend that nothing ought to be done that would interfere with the amenities of Kew Gardens, and I think he will see when he looks at the plans that this has been considered. One is a building for machinery, and the other is a building for carrying on the more delicate scientific operations. The former does not interfere with the amenities of the place. It is entirely out of view of Kew Gardens. It is placed in a corner surrounded by trees, far away from the Queen's Cottage and its surroundings. The other building is placed nearer the Queen's Cottage, but it will be surrounded by trees. It will be in a position that will not interfere with the view, and, of course, it is not a building that will be entered by many people, as the machinery building will be. It will be confined to a few scientific people, and in no sense a building that will interfere with the amenities of the Gardens. That is the information I have at the present moment, but I do not wish to anticipate what my noble friend may have to say when I receive the deputation. I can give him the promise that the voting of the sum of £7,000 will in no way prejudice the case.

*MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): In regard to the archæological research in connection with the school at Athens, I do not think the money expended has been creditable to this country when it is compared with the work done by other countries. If it is a fact that the grant is to be reduced or withdrawn—I was not aware of it—I hope we shall have some explanation of the grounds on which that decision has been taken. Possibly the right hon. Gentleman will be able to hold out some hope that such a retrograde step will be reconsidered, and that he will continue to subscribe this miserable pittance towards the great work of archæology.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: While I have had no opportunity to consult the authorities of the Treasury or the Chancellor of the Exchequer on this point, I imagine that the only ground for the alarm expressed is that the original grant for the British School at Athens is for five years, and that this term is drawing to a close. Nothing has been said in this House, as I understand, as to the possibility of renewal. The matter has never been under consideration. It has never been brought under my notice. The whole question of Government subvention of scientific investigation is a very important subject, and there is no doubt that this country has, from a traditional policy, lagged greatly behind other nations in this respect. It never occurs to us to do what the Germans, the French, or even what our cousins in America have done in making certain grants for investigations; and whether we are right or wrong I do not pretend to say. My own personal inclination is rather in the direction of Governmental aid in cases where you can hardly expect private aid to come forward; but at the same time I confess that I often think how strange it is in a very rich country like ours there are not found some people who, in a difficulty to find other and more profitable investments, do not attempt to earn glory for themselves by carrying on these investigations with the money that is required. I can only say that certainly the grant will not be discontinued without full consideration of the facts and interests involved.

Vote agreed to.

7. £67,500, to complete the sum for Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales.

*SIR F. S. POWELL: I wish to appeal to the Government to exercise a more generous policy towards the colleges and universities of England. The contrast between the amounts of the grants to two English universities, and to the University of Wales is, I think, not fair to the English universities. I am a member of the Court of the Victoria University, and therefore have some knowledge of the action taken by that university and of its proceedings. I do hope the Government will have some regard to the services rendered both to education and to science by the Victoria University. This is a new university, it has all the vigour, all the strength, and all the hope of youth, and I feel myself no doubt that in coming years, if the supplies granted by this House are equal to the occasion, it will perform a most distinguished part in the technical, classical, and highest culture of this country. If that be the case as regards the Victoria University I think it is as true as regards the university colleges. I can speak from an intimate knowledge of the services of the Yorkshire College at Leeds. That institution is greatly hampered for want of a larger grant. There was an inquiry some years ago conducted by highly scientific men who investigated the position and comparative claims of these university colleges. The sum assigned to the Yorkshire College at Leeds is entirely inadequate to its wants. We have by private gifts and the liberality of the city companies largely extended our buildings, our apparatus, and our plans. The inquiry which took place some years ago pointed to the fact that our buildings were not adequate to the work we desired to do. Since that time these buildings have been increased by private benefactions and by the magnificent gifts of the public companies, but we are still unable to perform the duties we are called upon to discharge. We have extended our education in agriculture, we have still further improved our arrangements for instruction in textiles, and we are hoping to raise that great industry to a condition more in accordance with the wants of the country and the importance of that pursuit. I trust the appeal I am making to-day will not be in vain, and that when the next occasion comes for a revision of these grants greater liberality will be exercised. I am not in a position to speak from personal knowledge of Owen's College, Manchester, but the information has been forthcoming from distinguished members of the controlling staff that they are suffering from the same difficulties that we experience in Yorkshire. I certainly hope, as we have had larger aid from the Government for elementary and technical education, that like generosity will be shown to our universities and university colleges. It is useless for this or any other country to improve the elementary and secondary education except the higher culture also is improved. It is by the constant development of the higher departments of education that the lower departments continue to prosper, and if the improvement of the higher departments ceases, decay must ensue in the lower departments. I am grateful to the committee for allowing me to make this representation on behalf of the Council, and I hope the time will come when my words will prove to have been spoken not in vain.

MR. STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I most heartily sympathise with the wish expressed that this grant should be increased, and I desire to raise a point which is perhaps closely connected with such possible increase. I believe the £25,000 a year which is divided between the specified colleges in Great Britain is allocated in accordance with the Treasury Minute of June, 1897, which, after considerable inquiry, distributed certain sums to various university colleges, allocating the money to them for a period of five years, on the understanding that the question should be again investigated and reported on before the end of that period. As the time is running out, I should be glad to know what are the intentions of the Government with respect to this investigation, and as to the way in which they intend, or expect, or wish that the claims and views of the different university colleges should be brought forward. It is important that these bodies should be heard before such an inquiry. Some difficulty has arisen in the past because these bodies have not been adequately heard. The point with regard to which I wish to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman is one that affects the University College of Dundee, in the well-being of which, in my capacity as rector of the University of St. Andrews, I am very personally interested. My reason for raising the matter is that there has been an irregularity and a want of continuity of action in respect of the University College of Dundee such as has not taken place with respect to any other of these institutions which are now under consideration. The University College of Dundee was started on exactly the same footing as university colleges in England. When this sum came to be given to university colleges a small grant of £500 was given to Dundee, and even that was not obtained without some considerable difficulty. £500 a year is a very much smaller sum than is given to the colleges in England, and one of the reasons then alleged is a reason which I trust the right hon. Gentleman will not allege now—namely, that the universities of Scotland receive a large grant from the Treasury. They do receive a large grant from the Treasury—a grant of £42,000 a year; they also receive a portion of the Probate Duty in the same way as a portion is devoted to secondary education in England. But let me remind the right hon. Gentleman and the Committee that that is done in accordance with the Act of Union between England and Scotland. While the Scotch provided for the maintenance of the castles of Stirling and Dunbar in good repair, they also had the good sense to insist upon adequate provision being made under the Act of Union from the Treasury of Great Britain for the maintenance of the universities. We may, therefore, put aside that portion which is given to the Scotch universities as being any reasonable argument against classifying the town of Dundee with other towns like Nottingham, Sheffield, and the like, which participate in this grant. Dundee stands exactly towards the University College of Dundee as Sheffield stands towards its college or as Newcastle stands towards the Newcastle College of Physical Science. The College of Physical Science in Newcastle is partly endowed by the University of Durham, as the college in Dundee is now partly endowed from the University of St. Andrews; there is no difference in character between them. As I say, £500 was given to the University College of Dundee. In 1894 that small grant was withdrawn, and it was not renewed until 1897, when there was a second investigation and a second distribution. It was then renewed at the figure of £1,000 a year, at which amount it has continued since. But why that change? Why that irregularity of action? It is not because of that irregularity of action in the past that I wish to make any complaint, but because of the difficulty which is introduced into the management of the University of St. Andrews and the University College of Dundee—of whose managing body I am president—by the uncertainty of action I have endeavoured to bring before the right hon. Gentleman. Why was the grant dropped in 1894? Here is the Report of the Committee to the Treasury, which Report was adopted in the Treasury Minute of 1894—

"Your Committee do not recommend that a grant should be made to the University College of Dundee, inasmuch as they consider that that College, being now part of the University of St. Andrews, has been withdrawn from the scope of the present grant, and will participate in future in the increased grant for Scotch universities."

That was the decision in 1894, in consequence of which the grant was dropped. There arose between 1894 and 1897 considerable doubt as to whether or not the University College of Dundee was incorporated in the University of St. Andrews. The matter was the subject of litigation, and the echoes of the contest still remain. I do not think they are fated to remain very long, nor do I say the subject is absolutely decided at this moment. Let us see what was done in consequence of the existence of that doubt. The Treasury Minute of June 2nd, referring to or acting upon the advice of the eminent scientific authorities to whom reference has just been made, reads as follows—

"My Lords take note of the terms of the Committee's Report with regard to the Dundee College."

That was a Report recommending a grant·

"In acceding to the Committee's recommendation that for the present"

—those words are underlined—·

"the College should receive £100 a year my Lords are guided, as they understand the Committee to have been guided, by the exceptional position in which the College is now placed."

The "exceptional position" which I have tried to describe is one of doubt as to whether it is incorporated or not with the University of St. Andrews.

"My Lords are of opinion that when the relations between the University and the College are settled this matter should be subject to reconsideration, and they must not be understood to admit the claim of the College to share permanently in the grant for University Colleges."

If those two Minutes mean anything, they at any rate run the risk of meaning that when the University College of Dundee is working harmoniously with the University of St. Andrews it shall then be mulcted to the extent of £1,000 a year. Is that a very hopeful prospect to hold out to one who, like myself, in the position I occupy with respect to these two bodies, is earnestly anxious to bring about a happy co-operation? It is really, so far as it goes, though I do not say it is made as such, an absolute bribe to disagree. What I want to point out is that when we are endeavouring to bring together the ancient University of St. Andrews—a university which has a more glorious history than almost any other educational institution in Great Britain, and certainly the most notable educational history of any such institution in Scotland—and the modern School of Science in Dundee, as an Act of Parliament has declared they should be brought together, it is extremely undesirable there should be hanging about the whole action this uncertainty as to the grant. It will not do to say that the University College of Dundee is getting an unlimited share of the grant to the Scotch colleges. It is strictly limited so that it cannot receive more than a certain amount, and that amount—which is £3,000—is in comparison with the general endowments of other colleges no large figure. Therefore I do earnestly hope we shall get some assurance that the University College of Dundee will not be treated in the spirit of the first of these two Minutes, and because of its incorporation, when it is brought about finally and completely, with the University of St. Andrews, deprived of the grant it is enjoying just now. The Committee must also remember that the University College of Dundee is doing a work with which the University of St. Andrews has nothing to do. The University College of Dundee is certainly part of and incorporated with the University of St. Andrews, but, on the other hand, it does a large amount of local technical and evening work which does not prepare people for a degree in a university and is absolutely comparable with the evening work of the University College of Nottingham, all of which work is part of the recommendation of such colleges to the enjoyment of the grant. One other point which I wish to bring before the right hon. Gentleman is that of this £25,000 a year which is divided between the university colleges of England on the one hand, and this one college in Scotland on the other, only £1,000 goes to Scotland. You are giving to the university colleges of Wales—and I am glad you are; do not think I grudge it at all—the sum of £12,000 a year; you are giving to those in England £24,000, the two sums together amounting to £36,000 a year; you are giving to the University College of Dundee £1,000 a year, and that is the whole amount that goes to Scotland. I know, as I have said before, that the Scotch universities have a grant, but it is in virtue of the Act of Union. Remember, too, that the educational ambitions of the Scotch nation are very great and worthy, and that they have done so much for the nation. It is well that they should be supported in a way which is in no sense pauperising, but which will not only assist those who have assisted themselves, but actually help forward the union of the University College of Dundee and the University of St. Andrews, and it is extremely desirable in every way that we should see ancient traditions united with modern institutions. Let the right hon. Gentleman not think there need be any difficulty in carrying out the allocation of this money to the right purposes. All I would say in conclusion is that I do earnestly press it on the right hon. Gentleman and the Government that they should give an assurance that when they again consider this matter such persons as represent the University of St. Andrews and the University College of Dundee and other bodies will be enabled to lay before the Treasury their views in the matter. I earnestly hope that this matter may be decided at an early date, so that this sword of Damocles may no longer hang over this young institution in Dundee. Everyone knows that when you have to draw up a programme of studies, erect laboratories, and so on, the uncertainty as to whether a grant of £1,000 will or will not be continued is a very serious drawback to all the work you are undertaking, affecting with uncertainty and insecurity a great many more steps in connection with the college than are affected by the mere sum of £1,000 a year. On behalf of the university which I so inadequately represent at the present moment, and of the University College of Dundee, knowing how closely it is related to the other university colleges in England, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will take into very careful consideration the remarks I have ventured to make.

SIR J. LENG (Dundee): As one of the representatives of Dundee and a member of the college council, I desire to express my indebtedness to the Lord Rector of St. Andrews University for the clear manner in which he has put before the Committee the case for the Dundee University College. There is reason for taking this course, inasmuch as my hon. friend has referred to the fact that in the year 1894, when the members of the college council had no opportunity of being heard, they were astonished to find that the very small grant of £500 was recommended to be withdrawn. It is, therefore, desirable that when this question comes to be reconsidered under the terms of the Minute of 1897, the representative of the Dundee University College shall have an opportunity of being heard. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that out of the £25,000 the almost microscopic grant of £500 was made in the first instance to Dundee, and yet this ewe lamb, as one may call it, was roughly slain and the grant taken away. My hon. friend's contention is that in equity Dundee has as strong a claim to have its grant continued, and not only continued, but increased, as any town in England. The college in Dundee is a comparatively modern institution. It was founded by the great generosity of a family of merchant princes. As time went on it was found necessary to increase the number of chairs, and others of the merchant princes of Dundee gave sums varying from £6,000 to £12,000 to bring the chairs up to date and the requirements of the time. Dundee has therefore done its part. Nearly £200,000 has been given within the last twenty years by those who have made their wealth in Dundee in order to secure that the young people of all classes may have the advantage of this local college, in connection with which there is an excellent technical institute, the classes of which are overflowing. The buildings are not large enough to hold the hundreds of intelligent youths and artisans who desire to attend these classes night after night. If there is any town in the kingdom which has done its duty by the poor and the working classes it is Dundee, and the fact that it has helped itself is a strong claim, if any claim is to be made on the Treasury, that at least it should be dealt with on the same conditions as the colleges of England. The terms of the grant which is now before the House are for university colleges in "Great Britain," and Scotland is part of Great Britain. At present, Scotland is receiving only £1,000 out of £25,000, and there have been threatenings that it should be deprived of even that. If there was any serious intention to that effect I am sure it would be protested against throughout the whole of the country north of the Tweed. Without enlarging upon what my hon. friend has so well placed before the Committee, I do hope the right hon. Gentleman will give an assurance that when this question is reconsidered the representatives of the college shall be fully heard, and that the grant shall not, at any rate, be diminished.

MR. ALLAN (Gateshead): I had no intention whatever of taking any part in this debate over the University College of Dundee, but I can speak with some degree of feeling upon this question, seeing that I am a Dundee man, and have witnessed the growth of education in Dundee more or less for over half a century. That we should be discussing in this House to-night the paltry sum of £1,000 for the University College of Dundee is something remarkable to me. I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman sitting on the Treasury Bench has never been in Dundee; I do not think he knows what Dundee is, or how that great manufacturing town has grown. I have seen it when it was very small, and I have seen it now it is very large, and the right hon. Gentleman should remember that he is concerned here with one of the principal towns in Scotland as far as manufacturing interests are concerned. It is the centre of the jute industry, of engineering, and of shipbuilding; it produces the best mechanics and engineers that can be found almost anywhere; and the question of a paltry £1,000 for the University College should never be discussed in this House, while there certainly should never be any question as to whether it should be continued. Thousands of young men there attend the night classes and the technical school; they go there after they leave the factory, the machine shop, or the shipyard, in order that they may get a higher education. It is a sorry sight that any Member of this House, or at any rate any Scotch Member, should stand up here, practically with cap in hand, to beg—a word I detest. We have no right to come here and beg for money for the University College of Dundee. We subscribe more than our share to the national wealth, and we have no right whatever to beg for this paltry £1,000. The right hon. Gentleman is always an advocate of progress, and always stands up for the education of the young men of the country. Why, then, should there be any question about this grant? You may say that the St. Andrews grant will suffice for both. Not at all. What the right hon. Gentleman ought to do he knows perfectly well. He should give them £5,000 a year for the purposes of education there, simply from the fact that it is the centre of a great manufacturing industry, and one of the first cities of Scotland in manufactures. But I am not going to beg from the Treasury, for Scotchmen never beg. We stand here and claim our right to a fair share of the wealth of this country to be devoted to education in Scotland. We have no right to come here and beg for the Dundee University College, and why should this £1,000 be taken away from the Dundee College? We ought to have a much larger sum for this college. The Lord Rector of the University knows nothing about Dundee, and I know all about it, and I say there should be no question whatever of giving this money to a young and energetic educational institution. Why rob this college of their little pittance? Such a proposal is not right, it is not fair or honest, and it is not just to Scotland.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanark, Mid): I am glad that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is present upon this Vote, because I think there is likely to be a misconception on the part of the Government officials that Scotland is getting a larger sum of money on this Vote than it really is. Here is the sum of £42,000 set down for the Scotch universities, but that sum should never have been on this Vote at all. By the Treaty of Union the Universities of Scotland were to be placed upon the Imperial Exchequer, and in order to discharge that burden the Exchequer got the whole of the Scotch estates. It was part of the Treaty of Union that the universities of Scotland were to be kept up at the national expense. That was a part of the bargain, and it continued until a few years ago, up to which time the whole expense of the Scotch universities were born upon the Imperial estimates. But what took place a few years ago? The Government tried to get rid of this responsibility. which was bestowed upon them by the Treaty of Union, of contributing this £42,000 a year for the Scotch universities. What did they do when they came to treat the equivalent grants between Scotland and Ireland? A sum of £30,000 was taken out of the money from Scotland, and given in subsidies to Scotch universities which it was the duty and always had been the responsibility of the Government to maintain out of the Imperial purse. You now have this £42,000 paid out of the Imperial funds for Scotch education, and you also have Scotland itself out of its own funds providing £30,000 for the Scotch universities. I venture to say that is an unfair way of getting rid of your obligations under the Treaty of Union. Down to the last few years you had the whole burden of these universities upon the Imperial Exchequer. You cannot wipe off a Treaty of Union by saying, "Here is a few thousand pounds more, and we will wipe you off for the future." What have the Government done? Here is a Unionist Government in power, with a majority of English Members. You have had the Scotch money at your disposal, and you have taken this £30,000 against the votes and the wishes of Scotch Liberal Members out of Scotch money, and you have applied it to discharge what was the duty of the Imperial Government—namely, to keep up the Scotch universities in a manner suitable to the times. If you had done this duty properly you would be paying the whole of the expenses of the St. Andrews University, and you would not have had to come upon Scotland for £30,000. In this way Scotland has been compelled to pay £30,000 a year for something which was an Imperial obligation. You are now adding to these sums the money for England and Wales. It is not very long since this Vote came on to the Paper, and it is since the University Act was passed. The result is that you are giving this new money to England upon the footing that you have already provided for Scotland. But you have done nothing of the kind. You are giving all this money to England, and Scotland is only getting £1,000. I wish also to refer to the College of Science in Glasgow, which is one of the largest attended colleges in the whole kingdom, and is doing admirable work. This college is now getting subsidies out of the grants in aid of the local authorities. This college does not get one single copper out of the Imperial fund. I ask if it is fair that, having an Imperial obligation under the Treaty of Union to keep up the universities of Scotland as a national undertaking; having got all the revenues of the universities upon the condition that you took over the obligation of maintaining these universities, is it fair to come here now and try to get rid of this obligation and take £30,000, by force, out of Scotch money.

I venture to say that that is not a creditable way of dealing with public education in Scotland. When we find that you are giving these grants to England we do not object. We are quite agreeable that England should get these grants, but we do say that Scotland ought to come in for a reasonable share of those grants. We are doing a great work at the College of Science in Glasgow, and we are not getting one single copper for that great work from the Imperial Treasury. In this matter of education we simply ask for justice, and for the discharge of your legal obligation. As regards the future, with reference to these new sums, you should give us an equivalent with England, but do not treat Scotland as having nothing to do with these matters. I am very glad to find the Member for the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen here, for I am sure he will corroborate me when I say that even with the £42,000 from the Imperial Funds and the £30,000 from the Scotch Fund there is not sufficient money to carry on the work of these universities as it ought to be carried on at present. The right hon. Gentleman also knows the valuable work that is done in the College of Science in Glasgow, and that it is entirely by local aid that that institution is being kept up. I hope that before this discussion closes we shall have a few words on this subject from the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. JAMES A. CAMPBELL (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities): I cannot refrain from saying that while I do not agree with the hon. Member opposite in all his complaints as to the way in which the Scottish universities have been treated by the Imperial Treasury, I do agree that in Scotland we have a claim to equal treatment with England with regard to the assistance given for new or additional university work. I hope that there is no reason to fear that this grant which has been enjoyed by the University College of Dundee will be withdrawn. I have known something of this college from its beginning, and I am sure that this money is needed there, and that it has been well bestowed upon that college. I am aware of its connection with the University of St. Andrews, and I agree that the effect of that connection does not place the University College of Dundee outside the need of such assistance as it has been receiving. I have no disposition to continue this discussion, which seems to imply some suspicion upon the intentions of my right hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury, for which I hope there is no justification.

MR. HANBURY: Practically the whole speech of the hon. Member for Mid Lanarkshire was an attack upon recent legislation with regard to the Scotch universities. After all, we must regard that legislation as being in existence, and that being so we must assume that that Act dealt fairly with the amounts which were allocated to these Scotch universities. With regard to the arguments which the hon. Member has raised in reference to this fund belonging to Scotland and being put aside for this purpose under the Act of Union, those are arguments which were no doubt raised when the Act I have alluded to was considered. We have now to deal with the Act as it stands, and under that Act undoubtedly it is a fact that a large sum of money is allocated to these universities. That being so, we are now asked with regard to the University College of Dundee whether we are going to continue this grant of £1,000. We reply—as we replied some time ago—that it is quite impossible that the Dundee college should have the advantage of a grant on its own account, and at the same time receive the advantages which it would derive from the grants made to the University of St. Andrews if it were entirely affiliated to that university. That, I think, is a reasonable ground to take up. If the University College of Dundee was placed in that position it would be different to that of any other college in England or Wales, and I think hon. Members opposite ought to be content with the very reasonable plea put forward by my right hon. friend behind me, that in matters of this kind the colleges in Scotland should be treated in exactly the same way as the colleges in England and Wales. That is a reasonable request, and so far as the colleges in Scotland are entitled to these grants they will be treated in exactly the same way as the colleges in England and Wales are treated. When Dundee College once becomes entirely affiliated with the University of St. Andrews, it will receive all the advantages and endowments which are given to that university, but it cannot expect to have in addition the advantages it is now receiving as a separate college. I understand from the speech of the hon. Member for Hoxton that his complaint is not so much as to the actual amount of the grant, but that he is anxious that the present condition of things should not continue, and that the connection between this college and the University of St. Andrews should take place as soon as possible. What has really happened is this. We have been in communication with the Scotch Office upon this question, and they have told us that as the connection between this college and the university is not yet entirely established we should not be justified in at present removing this £1,000 from the Vote. Until that connection is established this grant will, of course, be continued. My hon. friend the Member for Wigan complained that the sums allocated to these different colleges are not sufficient. I would point out to my hon. friend that towards the end of 1896 a Committee went very carefully through the whole subject, and it was upon the recommendations of that Committee that the Treasury acted, and the sums fixed are entirely in accordance with the recommendations of that Committee. As to the sum of £25,000 not being adequate, I do not think the hon. Member has any right to complain of this, because until two or three years ago the sum granted for the purpose was only £15,000; but in 1896 the sum was raised to £25,000, and that is the sum which will remain up to the year 1901. No doubt a fresh allocation will be made, and fresh claims will be brought in, and if the authorities of Dundee College can establish a fair claim to this grant no doubt their case will be favourably considered by the Treasury. We have now only to deal with the grant for the present year, and all I have to say is that that grant is considerably in advance of the annual grant made three years ago when the sum was only £15,000.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I happen to be officially connected with the University College of Dundee, and it is to that portion of the right hon. Gentleman's speech which dealt with that matter that I shall confine myself. I must express my disappointment at the substance of his reply. He has practically told us, notwithstanding the opinion expressed by the Member for the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen, that there is every prospect of this grant being lost, and he has given us the Treasury's reason for it. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that the University College of Dundee would be entitled to a continuance of this annual grant of £1,000 if it retained its separate existence, but he says it will not be so entitled when it is incorporated with the University of St. Andrews. And why not? Because, he says, it will share in the endowments granted to the University of St. Andrews. As far as I know that is not so. The University of St. Andrews when it completes the incorporation of this subordinate body will not derive one single farthing of additional public money to sustain its corporate existence. It simply comes to this—that this Act of incorporation between the University College of Dundee and St. Andrews University is to be penalised by the Treasury to the extent of £1,000 a year. In other words, that which has been felt by all the local educational authorities in the country to be a most desirable grant is to be abolished to the extent of the withdrawal of this annual grant of £1,000. I cannot see any reason to justify that contention. There is to be no change in the position of St. Andrews University. On the contrary, it is very probable that it will incur additional expenses on account of incorporation, and there is no change in the position of the University College of Dundee. The intention of the incorporation is merely to facilitate the working of both institutions, and because of this the money allocated to the College of Dundee is to be withdrawn. I say that is a principle which requiries reconsideration, and I hope that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman is not to be taken as the last word of the Treasury upon this subject. I do hope that the right hon. Gentleman will accord a full and fair hearing to the official representatives of the University College of Dundee. I will venture to repeat the appeal which my hon. friend has made, and I ask the Secretary to the Treasury to give us some assurance that before the preparation of next year's estimate and before he decides to withdraw this annual grant he will at least do us the favour of allowing us to be heard in support of the maintenance of this grant, and give us an opportunity of placing before him arguments upon that question.

MR. STUART: I think the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury might give us satisfaction by answering the appeal I made to him, and which has also been alluded to by the hon. Member who has just spoken. As I brought the matter forward in reference to the continuance of this £1,000 a year which is granted to the University College of Dundee, and as the uncertainty in which we have been left is a very serious matter, I really think that it is a little hard for the right hon. Gentleman to assume that he answers my position by saying that this college shares in the endowments granted to St. Andrews University. I think that is drawing the line a little too far. I also want to point out to the right hon. Gentleman the very solid fact which I think ought to affect the right hon. Gentleman in reconsidering the attitude he has taken up. He has spoken about the incorporation of St. Andrews University and the University College of Dundee as being a reason for withdrawing this £1,000 grant, because the Dundee College is to get the benefit of certain grants which will be made to St. Andrews University. But as I pointed out in bringing this matter before the Committee, that is exactly the position at the present time of a large college in Newcastle, which profits very largely by the grants made to the ancient University of Durham. That is not looked upon as any reason why a sum of money should not be granted to this college at Newcastle-on-Tyne. I have received but cold comfort from the right hon. Gentleman upon this question. His reply is cold comfort to every educationalist in Scotland who is desirous of seeing harmonious working between the ancient University College of St. Andrews and the new University College of Dundee. This has been indicated as desirable by Parliament, and yet it is held over our heads that as soon as that is brought about the joint concern is to be deprived of £1,000 a year. I do not think there is any reasonableness in that proposal at all. I do not desire to do more than point out my dissatisfaction with the reply of the right hon. Gentleman, and to express the hope that the authorities and the representatives of the University of St. Andrews and the University College of Dundee, whose interests are affected in this matter, will be afforded an opportunity of being heard, and that full consideration will be given to the arguments which have been laid before the Committee on this subject.

MR. CALDWELL: It now appears that as soon as the college at Dundee becomes part of a national university of Scotland it will then cease to have any claim on this fund. The total sum borne on this estimate for England, putting aside what is given to national universities, is £63,500, and the Scotch proportion of that amount, on the basis of eleven-eightieths, would be £8,730 for similar purposes, but only £1,000 is actually given to Scotland, and that is given to Dundee. You now propose to take that sum away from Dundee, but that will only make stronger the claim of the Glasgow College of Science for support from this fund. All we ask is that if you are going to give grants to colleges of science apart from national universities, give Scotland her equivalent share, which is £8,730. We have always complained that under this Vote Scotland gets practically nothing, and we have been told that Scotland gets money for her national universities; but that is an entirely different matter, as the Secretary to the Treasury has now been compelled to admit. As far as the Glasgow College of Science is concerned it is one of the best schools in the United Kingdom, and it is subsidised out of the Glasgow rates to the extent of £6,000 a year; and if English colleges of science get grants from this fund, why not the Glasgow College of Science also; not necessarily to cover all its expenses, but to assist the local subsidy, and to render its work, which is now much impaired for want of money, more efficient. I call the attention of the Scotch Office to the matter, and I ask the Lord Advocate to note that Scotland only gets £1,000 out of this fund, and that even that is to be taken away.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): As the right hon. Gentleman is being laid under pressure, it is necessary to mention other deserving cases lest they be forgotten. A hardship has arisen in the case of the University College at Sheffield, owing to the fact that the departmental committee examined into the case of that college at a time which happened to operate unfairly against it. The scheme of the departmental committee was that the grant in each case should be proportioned to the amount locally contributed. In the case of Sheffield the inquiry was held just before a very exceptional local effort had been made in connection with the Diamond Jubilee. If the inquiry had been held after that effort, the claim of the Sheffield College would have been in a very different position. I think the Secretary to the Treasury foreshadowed that there is going to be a reconsideration of the allocation of these grants, and I venture to express the hope that that reconsideration will not be put off on account of the disputes connected with the Scotch colleges, as to which I wish to say nothing.

Vote agreed to.

8. £5, to complete the sum for London University.

CLASS V.

9. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £255,384, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad, and of the Consular Establishments Abroad and other Expenditure chargeable on the Consular Vote."

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): I have put down a motion for the reduction of this Vote, not so much with a view to pressing it to a division as in the hope of being able to elicit some assurance from Her Majesty's Government with reference to a subject which I confess I view with great anxiety—namely, the reduction of our Consular establishments in the internal provinces of Asiatic Turkey. On the 22nd March last I put a question to the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs with regard to the Vice-Consulate at Bitlis, and the reply I received was this—

> "The British Vice-Consulate at Bitlis has not been abolished. The post is at present vacant, but is visited as occasion arises by Her Majesty's Consul at Van, and, if events should occur in Armenia rendering an appointment desirable, Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has authority to take the necessary steps."*

That reply only served to increase my anxiety, because it seems to show that Her Majesty's Government have in contemplation the reduction of the number of our Consulates in the interior of Asiatic Turkey. I do not ask for any declaration from Her Majesty's Government as to their general policy with regard to Turkey; but I think when we are asked to vote this large sum of money for consular and diplomatic services we have a right to ask for some explanation of what appears to be a grave departure in policy, involving, as I think, consequences of a serious and even disastrous character. Before I proceed to details I should like to place the general facts before the Committee. I think it is hardly realised that at the present moment we have no British consular representatives permanently residing in any one of the internal provinces of Turkey between Konia, Sivas, and Aleppo on the west and Van on the Persian frontier. That is to say, except in Trebizond and Erzerum on the north, we have absolutely no means of acquiring first hand information as to what is going on in any one of the great towns which were the principal scenes of the serious disturbances five years ago. That is not a situation which we can regard with equanimity. I do not want to revive unpleasant memories. Whatever view we may hold as to the culpability of Turkey for past events, I am quite certain that the Turkish Government is sincerely anxious to prevent similar occurrences in the future, and that so far as its power extends in the interior it will take steps to do so. But that does not justify us in withdrawing any guarantee we now possess. We have undertaken a very serious responsibility under the Berlin Treaty to help Turkey to render easier the conditions of life of the subject population of Asia Minor. The least we can do in fulfilment of such a responsibility is not to grudge the expenditure of a few hundreds of pounds in maintaining our representatives in the country, who can do much to avert breaches of law and order. I feel that we are bound not to withdraw any safeguards which we at present possess to help the Turkish Government to render happier and more tolerable the lives of the subject population in Asiatic Turkey. I think, therefore, we should do nothing to lessen the number of those Consuls through whom we can at present bring influence to bear. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman may say that these Consuls in the interior have very little power indeed, and that their whole time is generally occupied in tendering advice to the provincial governments which is never taken, and in writing reports which are pigeon-holed in the Embassy at Constantinople. That is not the view entertained by anyone who knows the country. I believe from my own experience that there have been instances in which the mere presence of these men has prevented acts of tyranny and injustice by individual governors and acts of folly by revolutionaries and others which might lead to fresh outbreaks of popular fanaticism and another series of disastrous consequences. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will not use the argument that the presence of these Consuls is not justified by the amount of British trade in these provinces. The amount of British trade in the interior has never been very great, and it is perfectly notorious that, but for political reasons, we would not have placed any Consuls there at all. I said that we have no consular representatives in any of the central provinces of Asiatic Turkey. It is true that we have an arrangement at the present moment by which the British representative at Diarbekr spends six months of the year in that town, and the other six in Kharput. I do not wish for a moment to throw any doubt on the capacity and ability of those who have undertaken the dual duty, but I am quite sure it is practically impossible for anyone to keep himself in touch with what is going on in the combined provinces of Mamoureted, Aziz and Diarbekr. This argument applies with tenfold force to the case of Bitlis. The right hon. Gentleman, in his reply to me, stated that the British Consul at Van had instructions to go over to Bitlis whenever circumstances arose which made his presence desirable. I should have thought that a mere glance at the map would have shown the inadequacy of that arrangement. The Consul at Van not only has an enormous amount of work to do in the town itself, but he has to make extended tours in the mountains of the Nestorian district south of Van, and also on the Persian frontier, where inroads by Armenian revolutionists and Kurdish raids are a perpetual menace to the peace of the vilayet. Even if he does go across once or twice a year to Bitlis he is only on the fringe of the vilayet which extends to the borders of Kharput, and includes the most poverty-stricken district of Mush. These are the points to which I wish to direct the attention of Her Majesty's Government. The assertion that we can always intervene if occasion arises seems to me to be perfectly useless. Past history shows that intervention after the occasion is generally nugatory, and that in 1894-5 almost every case in which disturbance arose and where the population got out of hand, was in towns where we had no British representative on the spot. I think one of the greatest blunders, to call it by its mildest term, ever made by a Government was made by the Government in 1882 when they withdrew our Consuls. Surely Her Majesty's Government having that warning before them will not commit a similar blunder. There are a great many circumstances in the Near East which give rise to considerable anxiety. We have been told that Russia has obtained from Turkey the power to veto the construction of all railways in the northern provinces, and to prevent Turkey—because Turkey cannot build railways herself—from using the only possible means of developing the country and increasing the happiness of the population. I confess I cannot understand how any Government which has undertaken in diplomatic phraseology to superintend the introduction of reforms which I suppose are not limited to reforms of the constitutional machinery of Government, but which extend also to the material improvement of the country, can acquiesce in that claim of Russia. However, that is a question of high policy which I will not enter into now. We have taken it upon ourselves to help these people, not merely Armenians or Christians, but the whole of the poor population of the interior, and I do think that the very least we can ask for is that we shall not deprive ourselves of one of the means ready to our hand, by which we can make our influence felt, particularly as there are a good many circumstances which are giving rise to a considerable amount of anxiety.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxi., page 42.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I should like to support the remarks of my noble friend. It does seem to me an enormous mistake to withdraw from the whole of

Asia Minor the sources of information which Her Majesty's Government have. It cannot be forgotten that England is under special responsibility with regard to Asia Minor. We have undertaken to defend Asia Minor against Russian attack in case any further attempt were made on it. That is a very serious responsibility, and in order to keep ourselves in a position to fulfil that responsibility, it does seem to me essential that we should retain the Consuls we have there. These Consuls have been regarded as the local advisers of the governors of these provinces, who go to them for advice and assistance, and what we see now is the wholesale withdrawal of those sources of information. Undoubtedly this withdrawal is very much more serious when we consider the circumstances to which the noble Lord has alluded, and which are a matter of notoriety, and the events which have quite recently occurred. It is hardly too much to say that the whole of Asia Minor is now divided between Germany and Russia into two spheres of influence, Germany claiming the whole of the south, and Russia the whole of the north. That is a very serious matter. We know how these spheres of influence begin, and we have sometimes seen how they end. First of all, a sphere of influence is supposed to be nothing more than the exclusive right to construct railways, and then the people who come to look after the railways sometimes take the form of troops. Are the Government prepared to tear up the treaty we made with Turkey, under which we have assumed responsibility for the safety of Asia Minor? I do not know, but there are people who think we have a very serious future before us. I believe there are persons in high authority who believe that we may be at war with Russia, and not only with Russia alone, but perhaps with Russia and Germany combined. What is quite certain is that we cannot make an effective war against Russia unless we have access to the Black Sea, and if we are to give over Asia Minor to Germany and Russia we may find ourselves in such a position that even the Sultan himself cannot give permission to our fleet to pass through the Dardanelles. If there is one place in the whole world where we have undoubtedly done good—and considerable good—to the people and the governors of the country, that place is Asia Minor. I therefore, with my noble friend, very much regret the continuance of the policy of withdrawing these Consuls. I would especially direct the attention of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs to the very threatening aspect of affairs which seems to be developing in Asia Minor, which is being divided as it were between Russia and Germany. I hope my right hon. friend will be able to tell us that the statements in the press are either exaggerated or altogether unfounded. I hope, also, he will tell us that the Government do not intend to go on with this policy of withdrawing British Consuls from Asia Minor.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I assume the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs does not wish to reply before we pass to other matters connected with this Vote. With regard to Item M, the question of the arrangement made with Abyssinia is one with reference to which I think we have been left very much in the dark. We are aware from other sources of the general nature of the arrangement come to a long time ago between the Government and Abyssinia. I cannot help thinking that the time has come when the publication of the arrangement which has been come to as to the boundary between Abyssinia and the Soudan would be wise. The reduction of which notice has been given by myself and others concerns a point we have discussed before, but which we are obliged to go on discussing, because the Government will not clear their own minds on the subject. I refer to the question of slavery in Zanzibar, and I propose to move a reduction of the salary of Sir Arthur Hardinge in respect to the position in Zanzibar. I wish to move this reduction without making any sort of personal attack on Sir Arthur Hardinge. I have, in common with all members of the Committee who have watched his public services, the highest respect and regard for Sir Arthur Hardinge, who is one of the best men in our service. But we think him out of place in this one particular station, not because of any defect or inability, but because of the particular and very special views which he holds—views different from the views of the vast majority of hon. Members—on the question of slavery. I do not think that that will be denied by anyone who has had the advantage of studying this question, and especially Sir Arthur Hardinge's replies to the Government. It cannot be denied that Sir Arthur Hardinge does hold these peculiar views. Indeed, on the two occasions in which he came into conflict with the Foreign Office and Lord Salisbury he maintained them with great ability. It is said that a promise as to slavery was given at the time we took over the administration of Zanzibar. Lord Kimberley was responsible for the conditions on which the administration was taken over, and he has altogether rejected the view that any such promise was given as the present Government think was given as regards slavery. Sir Arthur Hardinge's was the official speech, and there was not a word in it of which anyone could complain. The so-called promise under which we were supposed to be more tender towards slavery in Zanzibar than elsewhere was contained in a speech not of Sir Arthur Hardinge, but of Sir Lloyd Matthews, in command of the forces of Zanzibar. He is a man who is deeply imbued with the Zanzibar feeling, but I cannot help remembering that even in that speech of Sir Lloyd Matthews the word "slavery" was not used. The phrase relied upon was that in which he alluded to the intention of the British Government that the faith of Islam and all the ancient customs of the country would be maintained there. Now, Lord Kimberley, who gave the instructions on which that speech was made, denied that there was any right to commit this country to upholding slavery, and for a long time this so-called promise was not alleged as a defence of the recognition of slavery. Other reasons were given for not acting; by Sir Arthur Hardinge we were told that the country was disturbed. The First Lord of the Treasury had made a promise to this House that as soon as practicable the same steps would be taken in regard to the abolition of slavery in East Africa as had been taken in other parts of the British dominions. These promises to maintain old customs have often been made in regard to India, but they have never been held to mean that the laws of England with regard to slavery would not apply. There have been cases where direct promises have been made in regard to slavery. In Canada we promised the French that the institution of slavery would be maintained; but, of course, that promise was not acted upon. The case of the Soudan is very closely analogous to that of British India. In a series of speeches by Lord Kitchener he used language very similar to that, in regard to ancient laws and customs, employed by Sir Lloyd Matthews and Sir Arthur Hardinge. But slavery has been abolished in the Soudan, and what we want is that similar action should be taken in East Africa in regard to slavery as has been taken in the Soudan. I can say for those who are interested in this question that if the British Government would at once do in British East Africa what was done in India in 1843 we should, for the time, be satisfied. The abolition of the legal recognition of slavery which took place in India in 1843 is in advance of anything which the Government have been able to do up to the present time in East Africa. I repeat we do Sir Arthur Hardinge no injustice when we maintain that the arguments he has carried on with the Foreign Office point to a gradual alteration of slavery into a system of apprenticeship, which is, however, only slavery in another form. One of the greatest dangers we have to encounter is the keeping on in our protectorates of apprenticeship. Sir Arthur Hardinge has attacked particular missionaries in East Africa, and picked out one for special praise, because he held views differing from every other, and "at variance with popular prejudice," and particularly with the views of Bishop Tucker. I believe the views of Bishop Tucker are far more consonant with the views held in this House than are those of Sir Arthur Hardinge. Then there is Colonel Lugard, whose views are emphatic, and who believes that British East Africa has been prepared for the abolition of the legal status of slavery, and that it should be abolished. Very largely in consequence of what was stated in this House, and the debates and promises made in this House, we admit that some progress has been made in that direction in East Africa, although we think that progress has been slow. I beg to move the reduction of the Vote by £100.

*MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): In seconding the motion of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, I desire to endorse all the words which have fallen from his lips in paying a tribute of admiration to the ability of Sir A. Hardinge; but I also entirely endorse what he said in regard to the pro-slavery policy which has been pursued under Sir Arthur Hardinge and this Government throughout the area over which he has very large powers. I know that Her Majesty's Government feels somewhat inclined to resent these constant debates in reference to slavery, but I would point out that we have, as a result of these debates, on more than one occasion, got some steps in advance. The pressure we have been able to bring in this House has produced a better state of things in Zanzibar and the islands which otherwise would never have been obtained. One good that has been effected is that those who have charge of the slaves now know that they must treat them in a very different way from what they did a few years ago, and therefore our debates have done something for the cause of humanity. But it seems to me there has been something lacking in the policy pursued by the Government in the desire to see the immediate emancipation of the slaves. Two years ago Sir Lloyd Matthews in a despatch alluded to the "hasty and ill-timed interference of friends at home." These words are somewhat remarkable when we remember that Sir John Kirk sixteen years ago, in 1884, said that "the time was ripe for the entire emancipation of the population of the Zanzibar Protectorate." Sir Arthur Hardinge two years ago said, "It is idle to treat the African negro as if he were a full-grown free man." I am not one of those who think that the raw Kaffir or negro should be given the same amount of freedom as a white man. Naturally, they should be put under some kind of restriction, but they ought to have freedom as free men, and ought not to be considered the goods and chattels of another human being. As an illustration of the character of the spirit displayed from time to time by our officials in Zanzibar, I might allude to a case in which their policy of endeavouring to conciliate the Arab owners of slaves was shown. Soon after the present Government came into power an Arab was found guilty of most inhuman conduct towards a particular slave. In the Zanzibar *Gazette* it is recorded that this man, Abdulla Bin Ali, punished his slave by welding the irons on his flesh, and feeding him with one cocoanut morning and evening. Well, I am very glad that the Government prosecuted that individual, that he was found guilty, and sentenced by Judge Cracknall to seven years imprisonment. But the moment that Judge Cracknall's back was turned that cruel brute was released and practically whitewashed by the Government. I do not think that the policy pursued by Sir Arthur Hardinge and his subordinates is to be surprised at when we find Her Majesty's Government acquiescing in all these sort of acts in regard to slavery. For instance, the Sultan, who was put on the throne by the British Government, and who was not the natural successor of the previous Sultan, was allowed to inherit 30,000 slaves, and the excuse put forward was that the decree which prevented the inheriting of all slaves except by the sons of previous owners did not affect the Sultan himself. The pledges given by Her Majesty's Government have been very specific. On coming into power they said that slavery would be removed at the earliest possible moment, and as the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean had quoted, the Government pledged themselves to extend to the mainland the process already carried out in the islands. Sir Rennel Rodd stated that it was impossible to administer the mainland differently from the islands. Lord Curzon, when Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs two years ago, as an excuse for delay, said that

> "the conditions were not favourable on the mainland to carry out the pledge of the abolition of slavery. We must wait for the result of the experiment in the islands."

Now, from recent despatches we find that the result of the experiment has been successful in the islands, and to a large extent satisfactory. Let me read one paragraph from a despatch by Sir Arthur Hardinge dated 6th January this year—

> "The progress of the emancipation decree is at once gradual and steady, and is now attended with comparatively little trouble to the owners of plantations, who, with few exceptions, are adapting themselves to the new system, and paying their workmen, whether free men or nominal slaves, in pice."

I call upon the Government to carry out the pledge which Lord Curzon in this House, when Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, gave in the name of the Government two years ago. The present Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs at the commencement of last session said that the "strip of the mainland was only taken over in 1895, and since then there had been a rebellion and a mutiny to deal with."

Three events had been reported: first, a mutiny of black troops; second, an attack on the Indian contingent; third, the slaughter by a tribe of a British officer and nine men, and he gave these as an excuse for not carrying out their pledges. But he added that

"the Government did not depart from Mr. Balfour's pledge that at the earliest opportunity they hoped to extend to the mainland the process already carried out in the islands. It was Lord Salisbury's opinion that until the Government became more settled on the mainland it was impossible to take further steps."

The Government finds an excuse for its inaction in the dispatch of Lord Kimberley, and as has been explained by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean, it has only occurred to them as a suitable afterthought for throwing over the pledges of the First Lord of the Treasury and of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs as to the abolition of slavery on the mainland. When we analyse it what does that excuse amount to? We find that Lord Kimberley did not allude to anything except law and religion. Now, the Mohammedan law does not give any approval to slavery. It is well known that if an individual who belongs to the Mohammedan faith frees his slaves he will, according to the Koran, have a better time of it in a future life. Slavery is now permitted because it is said to be in accordance with ancient customs. Instead of correcting Sir Lloyd Matthews and the impression he may have left on the minds of a few Arabs, the Government are riding off on an excuse to prevent them carrying out their pledges. It seems to me that the Government have had many opportunities of carrying out their pledges, and if they had desired to do so they could have abolished slavery throughout the whole of the Sultan of Zanzibar's dominions. When the Sultan was appointed, and the mainland was quiet, they might have adopted some measure to release the 200,000 slaves in the mainland strip of the Sultan's dominions. That area is under the direct control of the Foreign Office, and they can do whatever they like on it. This strong Government seems to me to ride off on an excuse instead of giving instructions that any wrong impressions in regard to law and custom should be removed; and they keep to views which are contrary to the opinions of all Englishmen. I appeal to the House to support the resolution, not that we really want to reduce Sir Arthur Hardinge's salary, but because we want to abolish slavery in the protectorates, and as a protest that the Government in not carrying out the pledges they have given have committed what is little short of a breach of faith.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item P (Salaries of the General Consular Service) be reduced by £100, in respect of the salary of the Agent and Consul General at Zanzibar."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): Whilst we get any number of expressions of sympathy from gentlemen representing the Foreign Office with the views we have expressed on this side, we never get any further on the real question of giving freedom to the slaves under our own protection in the islands of Pemba and Zanzibar, and it is not far to look why we do not get any forwarder on this question. You have a gentleman connected with the island of Pemba as a public servant who is not in sympathy or harmony with the views the Government has expressed repeatedly in this House. That gentleman in the despatches we all read carefully has done this repeatedly. He has argued in those despatches time after time to allow a legal status to slavery in the island, to allow that to remain as it was before we established a British Protectorate. The Government in their despatches have given Sir Arthur Hardinge distinct and clear orders what to do, and in reply to these orders anybody who reads the Blue-books can see that he does not say he will carry out these orders, but that he argues against them. No public company, and no master with a servant would argue with him after a certain time. After giving him absolute and clear orders the time for argument is gone. If a public or private servant, after you have given perfectly clear and distinct orders, does not obey, all I can say is that I should join issue with that servant and say, "You must carry out my orders and policy or go your own way and make room for somebody who will." What I wish to ask is what is the policy of the Government? Is it Sir Arthur Hardinge's or is it not? If it is not the policy of Sir Arthur Hardinge, will they tell us what their policy is, and whether they will put servants in who will carry out their policy? We want action, and I think the country will call upon the Government to carry out their policy. We are the only European Government in Africa whose servants have acknowledged the legal position of slavery. A nice position for us to occupy at the end of the nineteenth century. We were the leaders of the great anti-slavery movement at the beginning of the century, and we are the last European power in Africa to-day paying, by a Vote of this House, a servant who acknowledges the legal status of slavery. That is a strong statement to make. Let us see whether it is correct or not. It is well to bear in mind what the facts are. In Mr. Lloyd's court near Mombasa there is a British judge paid for by a Vote of this House under the Consul General whose salary we are discussing at the present moment. On the court house the British flag flies, and the whole process is carried on in the name of Her Majesty. A slave owner appears before him and declares that a certain woman is his property. She repudiates the claim and asks for freedom, but does not get it. Mr. Lloyd in a British court hands her back to her master. We want to know what the Government are going to do. Is Mr. Lloyd to go on handing back slaves from the mission stations to their masters who claim them? If the Government say they propose to make no change, all I can say is that if they will stick to that then they are in absolute harmony with Sir Arthur Hardinge, and not in harmony with what they stated here last year. Are they or are they not going to carry out the able policy of Sir John Kirk and Sir Harry Johnstone? If either of these men was Consul General at the islands of Pemba and Zanzibar, the country would have unlimited confidence in him doing the best he could. If we had men there like Lord Cromer or Captain Murdo, who has charge of the Egyptian slave department, the country would have unlimited confidence, but anybody who reads the despatches of Sir Arthur Hardinge knows that his opinions are diametrically opposed to the opinions which the Government have expressed. Are we going to give up the fight with Sir Arthur Hardinge, or are we going to acknowledge that the civil servants in Africa are as lawless as some of the church clergymen who are civil servants in this country? It is a very serious position for the Government to take up. When they make statements from that bench on this question they have a right to be true and loyal to the House of Commons. They should see that their servants in Africa, whoever they are and whatever they are doing, carry out the policy which they lay down and which this House lays down as the proper and correct policy. Clearly the policy of Sir Arthur Hardinge is not the policy which has been laid down, and it is quite time that the Government said which of these two policies is going to be the policy of the future. There are some very ugly rumours in these two islands which I think require investigation—rumours that British subjects, in a way which we all know is absolutely illegal, are themselves interested directly or indirectly in this slave traffic, and that that is one of the reasons that Sir Arthur Hardinge does not carry out the instructions of the Government. I do not know whether it is true or not. It has been told me often enough that that is one of the reasons. If it is so, the Government should not protect any British subject who has got any remuneration or advantage from the slave trade. The law is perfectly clear that it is a criminal offence for any of Her Majesty's subjects to hold slaves, or take any profit or get any advantage from slavery. If there is not some truth in these ugly rumours, why does not Sir Arthur Hardinge carry out the policy so often expressed by Her Majesty's Government? These magistrates are acknowledging the legal status of slavery. What is their position if they come to England and you had one of these decisions to cite against them? Their position is that they have committed a criminal offence, and you would have the Attorney General defending these men in a criminal charge. We, as a great nation whose traditions have been on this question honourable and true, have taken the islands of Pemba and Zanzibar, and an immense territory in Africa, with the responsibility of tens of millions of natives—we have taken these in the face of Europe to do what? To stop the slave trade, and we have not up to the present time done anything at all to make things better. Before we took over these islands, we had a certain number of men-of-war protecting the seas from the slave trade. Have we the same number of men-of-war there now, and are we spending the same amount of money? Why, only the other day a ship was going from our own territory with a lot of slaves on board. It is an impossibility in these two countries to run free labour and slave labour side by side. You must make up your mind which it is going to be. Sir John Kirk told you in 1884 that one thing was certain—that until slavery is dealt with we shall never get free labour, that the present system is certain ruin, that it is neither free labour nor slavery. If you have slave labour, what is the position of free labour? You have got to wipe your hands of the whole thing, or let the people go on with their slavery. Sir John Philip knew the country, and fought for the principle of freedom which the present representative of Her Majesty is not fighting for. Sir Arthur Hardinge is fighting to the best of his ability for vested interest, and the party of slavery. He said on 13th March, 1884, that he believed the non-recognition of slavery by the law was essential to prosperity. Is the Government of that opinion? If the Government is of that opinion, why don't they carry it out and take away the men who are not carrying out their instructions? There is no greater authority than Sir John Kirk, and so far as you have gone in Pemba in the direction of giving freedom, which is very little, and even Sir Arthur Hardinge in his last report admits it—so far as you have gone you have only touched the fringe of it. There is an amount of prosperity going on now which Pemba never knew before. You should be strongly determined to carry out the policy which has been so often stated on that bench without any waverings or argument with your servant. It is past the time for arguing between master and man, and if you take the strong position the country expect, and which you promised to take, you need not fear anybody, but you may rest assured that when you do something to elevate these two islands, and to bring prosperity to them, you will leave at any rate a record that at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century you have done something for the freedom and betterment of humanity.

*MR. DUCKWORTH (Lancashire, Middleton): I wish to say how greatly disappointing our attitude to-night is on this subject, which has been brought so repeatedly before the House. The progress of emancipating the slaves in East Africa is very slow, and I am sure it must be to the right hon. Gentleman himself very unsatisfactory. The decree abolishing the legal status of slavery in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba was passed in Parliament in April, 1897; that is three years ago. What I want to emphasise is that, not only has there been no progress, or very little progress, in these islands, but what to my mind is more serious and important still, that nothing has been done on the strip of mainland which is administered from the Foreign Office, and where we are told there are some 200,000 slaves. I put a question to the right hon. Gentleman asking if anything had been done on this strip of mainland, and he had to reply in the negative. I had been informed during the recess that something had been done, and I sent a letter to the right hon. Gentleman, which he never answered. Hence my question to-day. In August, 1897, the First Lord of the Treasury promised in this House that the same conditions should be brought about on the mainland that obtained in the islands. In February last year the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs said to a deputation that waited upon him that the Government had not departed from Mr. Balfour's pledge, and at the earliest opportunity they hoped to carry out the same measures on the mainland as were already in existence in the islands, and yet he has to come before us to-night and admit that nothing whatever has been done in reference to the freeing of the slaves on the mainland. It must be very disagreeable to the right hon. Gentleman himself to have to stand before this House so repeatedly with excuses. Just look at these excuses brought before us in answer to our questions and arguments from time to time. At one time they say they are watching the experiment in the islands before they do anything on the mainland. Surely the time for experiment is long ago past. Then they go on to say that they are afraid there may be outbursts and disturbances on the mainland if they begin to unsettle affairs. Then the troubles in Uganda are pleaded as an excuse why nothing is done. Then the difficulty, forsooth, of obtaining free labour has been pleaded as an excuse.

But the last excuse is, I think, the emptiest and most unreasonable of all. The right hon. Gentleman has said again and again as an excuse why nothing has been done, "We cannot break our pledge to the Sultan." I wish the Government were as strong in keeping their pledges when human beings are before them or interested in what they are doing, as they are when it is a matter of bonds and gold which are at stake. We gave pledges to protect the Armenians, but allowed 100,000 of them to be butchered. Now when about 200,000 slaves are in existence on this strip of mainland, we are year by year met with this excuse that nothing is done on their behalf, and the right hon. Gentleman is compelled, I am sure much against his own nature, disposition and feeling, to stand in his place and simply make excuses to the House. What is there in this last excuse, so often used, and which very likely will be used again by the right hon. Gentleman tonight? It is said that Lord Kimberley before he left office in 1895 gave some pledge or understanding which is binding on the present Government. What is this pledge or understanding?

> "On the 1st July, 1895, Sir Arthur Hardinge, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, took over at Mombasa the administration of the mainland territories of the Sultan of Zanzibar, previously carried on by the Imperial British East Africa Company. Previous to doing so he had inquired of Her Majesty's Government whether, on assuming the administration, he might assure the Arabs that the Mohammedan law and religion would be maintained. The Earl of Kimberley, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, replied that he might make it clear that as regards religion and law and the Sultan's sovereignty, no difference was made by the change."

How was this interpreted to the Arabs and the slave dealers on the mainland and in the islands of Pemba and Zanzibar? This is an extract given from the despatch written by Sir Arthur Hardinge, in July, 1895, describing a public meeting which had been held in Mombasa, and attended by the Wali and the leading Arabs, when Sir Lloyd Matthews is stated to have made a speech in Swahili, of which the following is a translation—

> "I have come here to-day by order of our Lord, Seyyid Hamed-bin-Thwain, to inform you all that the company have retired from the administration of his territory, and that the great English Government will succeed it, and Mr. Hardinge, the consul-general at Zanzibar, will be the head of the new administration, and will issue all orders in the territory under the sovereignty of His Highness. And all affairs connected with the faith of Islam will be conducted to the honour and benefit of religion, and all ancient customs will be allowed to continue, and his wish is that everything should be done in accordance with justice and law."

That is now interpreted as something intended to cover slavery. Since then we have had Lord Kimberley's emphatic denial that any pledge with regard to slavery was given at all. I shall not repeat it. It has been brought before the House, and it has been in the public press. I have emphasised the words that "all ancient customs will be allowed to continue." It was never intended that these words should be put there, but they have been read into it purposely, I am afraid, to include the continuation of slavery on the mainland. Why have not the Government pointed this out to their officials? Why have they allowed five years to go on without pointing out that they made a great mistake? They have done that to their credit in another instance to which I will now refer. In April there issued from the Foreign Office a remarkable paper. I suppose it has been sent to all Members of Parliament as it has been sent to me, but perhaps many may not have gone through it carefully. It is worthy of careful perusal, for it is a most remarkable document. It refers to correspondence respecting slavery and the slave trade in East Africa and the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. This correspondence referred to the capture of slave dhows in Zanzibar Harbour, and also to an inquiry as to certain kidnapping of people by Arabs, who watched their opportunity, ran on to the mainland, set the villages on fire, and while the people were running half mad with fear they kidnapped them, put them into these dhows, packed like herrings, and sailed away in order to sell them as slaves in Arabia. This shows that there is still need for great vigilance on the part of those who are sent to coast about in these waters, and it is very interesting to find that our "handy men" can not only fight in South Africa, but can also look after their duty on these coasts, and endeavour to prevent this kidnapping of people and the selling of human beings into slavery. Wherever they can they pounce on these inhuman fiends and bring them, as they deserve to be brought, to justice. These papers reveal another striking instance, showing the bias of our officials in favour of the Arabs and against the freedom of these people according to law. I will not trouble the Committee, as I might, by reading the correspondence in this paper; Members can read it for themselves. I will merely summarise a few of the things so as to give a clear idea of the facts of the case. It appears that a circuit court, at which a British official presides, was instituted for the purpose of carrying out the Sultan's decree, and slaves who claimed their freedom under that decree, and gave their names and the names of their masters and satisfactory proof of their identity, were liberated in great numbers. That this was satisfactory to the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor in office is shown clearly enough. Mr. Curzon said on the 10th February, 1898—

> "that the case of any slave thus applying for his freedom must be settled at once."

This was evidently too wide a door and too easy a way for these officials on the mainland. They complained that many of these freed slaves became vagrants, and so, forsooth, to prevent men becoming vagrants they must be deprived of their liberty and kept in slavery. These officials put into force a supplementary article of the decree, which said—

> "that any person whose right of freedom shall have been formerly recognised shall be bound on pain of being declared a vagrant to show that he possesses a regular domicile and means of subsistence."

I take it that there are a great number of men in this country who would have a difficulty in doing that, but we do not put them into slavery or even into prison because of their inability to do so. But that is not the worst. These freedom-loving representatives of ours interpreted this article in their own way. They said that it referred to the condition of a slave before, and not after, he secured his liberty, and so they sent out notices that before they were freed the slaves must agree with someone to give them a home and land to cultivate, and secondly—

> "When they have found a place to live in they must bring with them the owner or some responsible person or a letter to state that they (the proposed employers) will be responsible for the future of the freed slave settling on their land and will give them land to cultivate."

This is part of a letter, and if I could give the Committee the whole of it they would find that the writer, Mr. Armitage, one of the agents of the Friends' Industrial Mission, goes on to say that many cases of hardship occur through obstacles being placed in the way of slaves obtaining their freedom. Many had to walk long distances; they waited about the Court for several days and then returned very much disheartened because they had not secured their liberty. And no wonder! He then goes on to say—

> "A slave now to obtain his freedom must leave his master's shamba and run the risk—no light one—of being arrested as a vagrant while he is endeavouring to find an employer, and when he has found such a man the question asked will be, 'Are you free?' and if the reply is 'No,' 'Go and get free first' is certain to follow. The man goes to the court, and, after waiting probably several days before he can even obtain admission there, finds all his trouble in vain, he must tramp back again to his prospective employers, who in all probability will decline to go to the Court or give the man a letter. And who could conscientiously make himself responsible for the future of a free man who could at any time leave the shamba when he chose? How is such a man to live honestly while endeavouring to carry out these orders? Is not this new rule more likely to cause vagrancy than to stop it? If, on the other hand, a man has got his freedom, and can show his medal or his papers (papers are not being given now), and say, 'I am a free man,' he will, without doubt, at once obtain work. Mr. Farler himself supports this view, for you will notice he says in his letter: 'There are hundreds of people ready and glad to make arrangements with freed slaves,' but he does not suggest they would make arrangements with them before they are freed. The sort of people likely to trouble the country as vagrants are not those, in my opinion, who take all the trouble which is involved in attending the Court and obtaining freedom. In nearly all cases it occupies several days, and is tedious and trying in the extreme."

If this is not a way how not to do it, I do not know what is. I could say a great deal more upon this point, but I will not detain the Committee. I am very glad that in this matter the Foreign Secretary, Lord Salisbury, has put an end to this nonsense, and I wish the Government would show the same decision, firmness, and determination all through. What has he done? He has shown very clearly that these officials have put their own interpretation on this matter. Let me read the following—

> "The Marquess of Salisbury has had under his consideration your letter of the 23rd ultimo, in which you draw attention to the circumstances in which effect is being given in the Island of Pemba to the decree issued by the Sultan of Zanzibar in April, 1897, abolishing the legal status of slavery.
>
> "The interpretation which Mr. Farler appears to have placed on Article 4 of that decree, and to which you specially allude, is not one which commends itself to Her Majesty's Government.

"In Article 4 the expression, 'Any person whose right to freedom shall have been formally recognised under the second Article, shall be liable to any tax, abatement, *corvée*, or payment in lieu of *corvée*, which our Government may at any time hereafter see fit to impose on the general body of its subjects, and shall be bound, on pain of being declared a vagrant, to show that he possesses a regular domicile and means of subsistence,' should not be interpreted as laying any obligation on the slave to find someone to be responsible for his future good behaviour.

"Lord Salisbury has accordingly instructed the Acting British Agent and Consul General at Zanzibar by telegraph in this sense, and has at the same time directed that the cases which had been decided in accordance with the above interpretation of the decree should be reheard without delay."

Would the Committee believe it—the right hon. Gentleman himself who sits opposite signed that telegram, and yet he comes here and stands up in his place and screens these officials. Again and again he has attempted to screen them, to defend them, and to apologise for them. Even the reply sent to this telegram, which will be found in this Paper, shows the spirit of these men and that they ought to be dealt with as we should all deal with them if they were servants of our own. Acting Consul Basil Cave has learned his lesson from Sir Arthur Hardinge, and he shows in his reply to the Foreign Secretary what sort of man he is, clearly indicating that just as a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still, so he is, in spite of what Lord Salisbury says. He goes on to lecture Lord Salisbury, and to tell him what the consequences will be if such a course is carried out. The Consul General has been on his holidays; he is back again at his duty; but while he was on his holidays he touched at the Cape, and attended a public meeting there, at which he brought up this question of slavery and sneered at the sentimentality of Exeter Hall and about "unctuous rectitude." The fact is, that these officials hob-nob with the Arabs in these quarters, as is quite clear from the letters in the paper to which I have referred. When Sir Arthur Hardinge got back to his duties he went to inspect the different places. Of course, when people know that the "head boss" is coming they prepare for him, and he sees what they want him to see. A man can go to Africa without seeing lions, but if he goes to see lions and looks for them he will find them. And so the head man, the Consul General, went round to see these places, and he concludes his Report to the Foreign Secretary with these words—

"The Arabs, reassured by the regular payment of compensation, are appreciative of its justice, and, on the whole, are well disposed towards it. They recently showed, indeed, their good feeling by the unprecedented step of decorating the town of Chaki Chaki with flags and bunting last Christmas Day in honour of the chief religious festival of the English officials working in their midst. The impression derived by me from my visit of inspection to Pemba was one of steady progress, reflecting much credit on the Sultan's Government and its officers. The contrast between the state of the island to-day and on the occasion of my first visit to it in the latter part of 1894, before any attempt had been made to introduce European control, is undoubtedly very striking."

What a burlesque! Mohammedans celebrating Christmas with Christians, and both preventing the slaves who have a legal right to their liberty from securing it. This is a serious matter, and I feel sure that Parliament will not much longer allow the right hon. Gentleman to stand up and excuse these officials, who are not carrying out as they ought the law of the country. What is more, I feel sure that the country will not stand it. There is a very strong feeling in the constituencies on this question, and if it were not that so much attention is taken up by the lamentable war in South Africa, we should hear more of this matter than we have heard. England is still the home of the free, and I hope she will continue to be.

"'Tis the land of the free,
So it ever shall be;
Her children no fetters can bind.
Ere Britons are slaves
She shall sink in the waves,
And leave not a vestige behind.

If the African stand
But once on her strand,
That moment his shackles are broke;
A captive no more,
He leaps on her shore,
And shakes from his shoulders the yoke."

But not only have poets sung the praises of the liberty of this Empire, but orators and statesmen have used their burning eloquence on this glorious theme, and in the words of one who was able to speak on this subject with great eloquence, I will close these remarks.

"I speak"—said he—"in the spirit of the British law, which makes liberty commensurate with and inseparable from British soil, which proclaims, even to the stranger and sojourner the moment he sets his foot on British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation. No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced; no matter what complexion, incompatible with freedom, an Indian or an African sun may have burned upon him; no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been broken down; no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery—the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain the altar and the god sink together in the dust, his soul walks abroad in her own majesty, his body swells beyond the measure of his chains, that burst from around, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation."

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): By the rules of the House I can only deal with the discussion initiated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, and the particular motion with which he concluded his speech. But I can say that the remarks made by hon. Members respecting Asiatic Turkey will receive careful attention, and that I do not think there is any indication of a serious change in the policy which the Government have previously carried out. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the question of Abyssinia, and asked the Government to make a statement as to the present position of the frontier negotiations. That is not in our power at the present time to do. The negotiations have been going on for a considerable period, and are being conducted in a wholly amicable fashion with the Emperor Menelik, but they depend almost entirely upon the progress of the survey of territory. That survey has made some progress, but the surveying party have met with very great difficulties, and until that work is accomplished it will be impossible for us to make any statement as to the line of demarcation to be adopted. The right hon. Gentleman very rapidly diverged from that subject to one which has always interested the House very much—namely, the question of slavery, chiefly on the mainland of East Africa. I find some difficulty in answering the criticisms which have been made to-night, not because they contain any fresh matter, but because though I have been Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs for something less than two years; but during that time I have had to trouble the House with no less than six or seven set speeches—made in reply not to fresh orators, but on every occasion to almost identically the same speakers, who have, if I may say so without disrespect, almost always employed identically the same arguments. I do not say they have all diverged into the poetic vein of the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken. He, at least, has added a fresh lustre of quotation to a well-worn theme, but most of the speeches I confess I know almost by heart, and a great deal better than I know the speeches I have made in reply to them. The point I have to make in the very few remarks I propose to address to the Committee on the subject is that there is no difference of principle between Her Majesty's Government and those who have addressed us with such vigour. The desire for the abolition of slavery is absolutely identical in all quarters of the House. The only question between us is whether in this particular case it is practicable or desirable that the transition from the one state to the other should be abrupt or gradual. Hon. Members who have spoken to-night press for an abrupt transition; the Government think they should content themselves in the case of the mainland strip of about ten miles in breadth, with a gradual transition. I submit that, in view of the decision which has been come to on previous occasions, it lies with those who oppose this policy, which is the policy of the late Government as well as of the present Government, to show that some evils are occurring, that those who have administered the law have been found not to have acted in accordance with the expectations which had been formed. But this evening we have not had one shred or suggestion of evidence that anything has occurred in connection with slavery on the east coast of Africa to justify this House in supposing that the expectations which were held out have not been fulfilled. We have not had one case of cruelty or of complaint brought before us; we have had only one breach of the law, and that was three or four years old, and had already been disposed of.

MR. BAYLEY: Her Majesty's representative at Mombasa is yet acting contrary to the law with regard to slavery there; he is doing so to-night I believe.

*MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member did not bring before us any specific cases. What the hon. Member did was to content himself with a very general charge against Sir Arthur Hardinge of a most libellous character, and which he did not support by a tittle of argument or evidence. The hon. Member said that Sir Arthur Hardinge acted as he did because some British subjects were interested in the slave traffic.

MR. BAYLEY: Excuse me; I said there were rumours to that effect, but that I did not believe them.

*MR. BRODRICK: Oh, I beg pardon. The hon. Member omitted that important qualification. These are only rumours, and yet the hon. Member says Sir Arthur Hardinge laid himself out to protect the slave trade from a corrupt motive, to assist a certain number of British subjects whom he did not specify.

MR. BAYLEY: I said distinctly that that was a rumour which was pretty generally held.

*MR. BRODRICK: Then I appeal to the House whether it is desirable that hon. Members speaking on mere rumour —which I have never heard before, although I take a good deal of interest in the question—should, without a single fact or quotation or tittle of evidence to support it, get up here and advertise to the four winds of heaven the charge that Sir Arthur Hardinge had from a corrupt motive over and over again—

MR. BAYLEY: I never used the word "corrupt."

*MR. BRODRICK: Over and over again—at least half a dozen times—the hon. Member declared that Sir Arthur Hardinge laid himself out to frustrate the intentions of the Government. Now he says it is a pure rumour that certain British subjects are interested in the slave trade. The whole suggestion is an absolute fabrication, and the currency the hon. Member has given to it appears to me to do very little credit to his position as a Member of the House of Commons. The hon. Member who has just sat down said there had been very little progress in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, and that nothing whatever had been done on the mainland. These statements are, if he will permit me to say so, the very reverse of the facts. In the first place, with regard to Zanzibar and Pemba, it is perfectly true, as I have told the Committee on various occasions, that a great many of the slaves will not take advantage of the power of becoming free which has been given them—a power which is perfectly well known to every slave throughout the two islands. Inexplicable as it may seem to us, everybody who has had anything to do with the islands or with the position of slavery in the islands is aware that there is a certain old feudal system between the masters and the slaves, that where the slaves have been well treated, they are not desirous of changing their position. Consequently, the number who have come to the court for emancipation has not been as large as we had originally hoped and supposed it would be. There were, however, nearly 5,000 last year, and a very large number were freed without coming to the court. In the island of Pemba last year there was a very serious outbreak of small-pox, which carried off a large number both of slaves and of free-men, and caused an almost total cessation of appeals to the court. I do not think that anyone, reading the Report laid before the House with regard to the state of slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba, can deny that there is great evidence, not only of complete contentment, but of the fact that the change being carried out in this gradual manner has led to an increase in the prosperity of these two islands. When we come to the mainland strip, it is perfectly true that the full measure of emancipation which has been given in Zanzibar and Pemba, and which my right hon. friend foreshadowed in a speech made four or five years ago in which he said that the same system would be carried out as soon as possible on the mainland, has not yet been given. I have pointed out on previous occasions the difficulties in the way of making a further move in that direction as rapidly on the mainland as has been done on the islands. But there is no question whatever that the situation of the two places is wholly distinct. The power and influence of the Sultan over his subjects in Zanzibar and Pemba has been very considerable, and has gone a long way towards bringing about the present state of things in the islands, but that power is not equal on the mainland. There has, however, been a gradual process of emancipation going on there. In the first place the sale and purchase of slaves is not allowed, and has not been allowed for many years on the mainland strip; then all children born of slave parents since 1890 have been born free; then there are removals from the mainland strip, and the employment given in the interior being considerable, the inducement to remove increases emancipation.

MR. DUCKWORTH: But they go into slavery when they return.

*MR. BRODRICK: No, I think the hon. Member is mistaken.

MR. DUCKWORTH: When they come within the ten miles limit their master can claim them.

*MR. BRODRICK: I have never heard of a case. Then no inheritance can take place in slaves except by direct succession. The slaves of any man who dies without direct or lineal heirs are all freed. The consequence is that progress is gradually being made towards complete emancipation. It is our desire that that process should be accelerated, but in the meantime it must not be supposed for a moment because we have not been able to accept the views of hon. Members opposite that any injustice is going on. Those who are still slaves on the mainland strip are equal to their masters before the law and before the courts. As in India, under the Act which is quoted here as the palladium of the liberty of the slave, every man who has been a slave is not declared by law to be free, but it is declared by law that every man who is a slave is able to come before the law, equally with his master, and as against his master. That is the case on the mainland of East Africa. The consequence is that cruelty, oppression, violence, maltreatment, has been, as far as we can judge, stopped. If it has not been so, we can count on it that the missionary and other bodies would have informed us of cases which required looking into. I said that I would not trouble the House at any great length, because we have on many previous occasions put forward these views, and I can only say that I do not believe Sir Arthur Hardinge deserves the strictures passed upon him. When the time comes to look back upon Sir Arthur Hardinge's administration as a thing of the past it will be remembered that it was under his administration that the whole of Zanzibar and Pemba had become free, that the process of emancipation was carried on at a rapid rate along the East Coast of Africa, and that, while there were frequent debates in this House, not one single case of violence or oppression of slaves by their masters on the mainland could be alleged.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I think the right hon. Gentleman was not well advised when he commented in a somewhat sarcastic way upon the frequent debates on this subject, and on the fact that the same speeches were made on each occasion. What does the right hon. Gentleman expect? This House would not represent the general feeling of the great body of the British public if on every occasion when that Vote came up a discussion was not raised upon this question. It is only a small point, and it is not easy within so limited a compass to use new arguments. The same old arguments are in force now that were in force four or five years ago, and what we complain of is that those arguments have so little effect on the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues, and their representatives in East Africa. The country has had remarkable patience in this matter. I do not know that that patience has always been displayed in the same degree as now, for I remember that under the late Government—when I confess I was not paying very much attention, except in that left-handed sort of way which a man in one Department looks upon the affairs of his colleagues in another Department—a furious onslaught was made on that Government for their negligence and remissness, in not dealing with this matter, in a much more summary and energetic way than has since been shown, by the present Secretary for the Colonies. I think the right hon. Gentleman therefore has no reason to complain of the temperate and quiet way in which my hon. friends have discussed this question to-night or of any renewal of this discussion which may periodically occur. The right hon. Gentleman has said that there could be no abrupt transition, and that the transition must be gradual. Nobody has asked, I understand, for an abrupt transition, but what is meant by a gradual transition? The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of the automatic effect on slavery of the fact that all children born of slaves since 1890 were free. They are, of course, increasing, and I suppose there is a certain automatic process in the introduction to the world of children in those regions; at the same time, that is very small comfort to those born before 1890. They remain in the same condition in which they were. It is not necessary to bring forward cases of excessive cruelty; what the British public and British sentiment object to is the thing itself, the status of slavery. What we object to is the existence of men in that condition, whether the slaves are well or ill treated. Undoubtedly many of them are well treated, just as in the Southern States of America there are thousands of slaves who were exceedingly well treated; and they showed no desire in this case to take advantage of the freedom offered. I remember a story told by a traveller who met a wealthy negro found in a state of slavery. The traveller said, "Why don't you, who are so wealthy, purchase your freedom?" The reply was, "No, sir; nigger property is very bad property." He would not invest money in himself. That might be the case in Zanzibar and elsewhere, but it does not touch the fringe of the question. The Government must recognise the strong and hereditary sentiment in this country in favour of the abolition of slavery—the proud idea that wherever the Queen's authority exists there can be no such thing as a man being the chattel of another. The right hon. Gentleman has not shown the Committee that there has been any active effort on the part of the Government to carry the process to the utmost extent in which it could be carried. Everyone knows that Sir A. Hardinge is one of the most efficient servants possessed by the country, and I have not a word to say against him; but everyone in a position such as his is naturally largely influenced by the *genius loci*; he sees the difficulties, but he is not so alive to the profound sentiment of this country. My hon. friends have brought forward this matter again from the same motives which actuated them before. The right hon. Gentleman says that the Government have every desire to accelerate this process. Let them show some evidence of this desire and some result of it. Let them make it plain to Sir A. Hardinge that the country is really in earnest in this matter, that it is not a mere pious opinion, a mere decayed tradition that there should be no slavery under the Queen, but that it should be put into force, not as the right hon. Gentleman suggested, abruptly, or in spite of all the difficulties that may stand in the way, but, at all events, with the greatest possible speed that is consistent with the engagements and the interests of Her Majesty's Empire in that part of the world.

COMMANDER BETHELL (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): What I think upon this question—and what a great many of those think who speak annually upon it—is that Sir Arthur Hardinge has apparently set himself to put every conceivable difficulty in the way of meeting our views. I will not criticise Sir Arthur Hardinge now, for I daresay he is doing the best that can be done under the circumstances. My right hon. friend has complained that the speeches year after year have been more or less of the same character, but what I want particularly to ask my right hon. friend is that very complicated question which arose two or three years ago. I desire some explanation as to the action of magistrates who are British subjects on the ten-mile strip of the mainland with regard to questions of slavery which are brought before them. The House will remember that two years ago, in a short debate on this subject, the Attorney General then laid down the law with respect to the rights and powers of British subjects in dealing with questions of slavery. We pressed the Attorney General, and my right hon. friend the Leader of the House was good enough to say that he would take care that the opinion of the Attorney General was cabled to the persons concerned; and this was done. We were told that a British subject might not adjudicate upon a person who had escaped from slavery and whose master asked for him back again, but that they might adjudicate upon the question of ownership of slaves. That strikes one as being a very quaint illustration of the sinuosities of the law. It will be interesting to know what the magistrates who are British subjects upon this ten mile strip now do. Do they adjudicate on any questions at all where slaves are concerned? Do they confine themselves only to those cases where the question of ownership is raised as between two persons? That is to say, if one person has a slave and he is claimed by another, I understand from the Attorney General's decision that the British subject, being a magistrate, could adjudicate. Are those the only cases? It does strike me that it would probably be much better if the British subject refrained from adjudicating upon questions of slavery at all, and those questions might be left to the Mohammedan persons who hold a certain amount of judicial authority in that strip of mainland. It strikes one that if a British official is allowed to adjudicate in such a case as I have mentioned it is very likely that he would attempt to adjudicate on questions of returning persons from freedom to slavery. There would be a great danger of that, and the House would be glad if my right hon. friend could assure us on this point, and, if possible, tell us what are the duties, the powers, and the responsibilities of magistrates upon that ten-mile strip who are, at the same time, British subjects. I will not join in the criticism which has been made upon the general question. I think that probably I do not go quite as far as many hon. Gentlemen on the other side upon this subject. I believe there are enormous difficulties connected with the question, but we must recognise that although for something like thirteen or fourteen years we have been pressing this question, it does not seem that very much has been done, or that as much has been done as we are entitled to expect.

*MR. BRODRICK: In reply to my hon. friend I may say that last year, early in March, instructions were issued providing that no British official should in future administer the law in any case involving the sending back of persons into slavery. That rule has been strictly observed. I have not heard of any case coming before one of the Sultan's judges which was governed by the undertaking that the religious law should be observed. It seems to have been entirely forgotten by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition that an undertaking was given by Lord Kimberley that the law should be observed.

COMMANDER BETHELL: But they do adjudicate upon other cases dealing with slavery.

*MR. BRODRICK: Yes, but British officials do not adjudicate in any case which involves the sending of a slave back to a slave-owner.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 39; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 144.)

AYES.

Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fry, Lewis
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir Wm. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kilbride, Denis
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Maddison, Fred.
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morgan, W Pritchard (Merthyr
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Souttar, Robinson
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Joseph A. Pease.

NOES.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Rt. Hn. A. H. S.-(Hunts
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bethell, Commander
Blakiston-Houston, John
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derby.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John C. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Curzon, Viscount
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Gedge, Sydney
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Goschen, Rt. Hn. G. J. (St. Geo's
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool)

Lowe, Francis William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
McArthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton)
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Peel, Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Pollock, Harry Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir Matthew W
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Strauss, Arthur
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Wyndham, George
Young, Commander (Berks, E.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. ELLIOT (Durham) said he desired to give the right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the Vote an opportunity of explaining what had taken place with regard to the very important matter which had been brought before the Committee. The noble Lord the Member for Kensington, who spoke with so great experience of the Turkish Empire, had referred to the withdrawal of our Consular officials, and particularly to the withdrawal of the Consul at Tiflis. The noble Lord had pointed out how very important it was when difficulties arose in these distant places that this country should have a trustworthy representative who would inform the Government as to what was likely to take place, and that could not be effected if we withdrew our Consuls. He admitted that on a former occasion the right hon. Gentleman was unable to give a full explanation, because a reduction of his salary having been moved he was precluded from going into the whole question. Now that there was nothing to prevent the right hon. Gentleman from entering into the question, and he hoped the Committee would be told what had been done and what it was intended to do with regard to the matter.

*MR. BRODRICK: I do not desire to pass over what fell from my noble friend, who takes the greatest interest in this part of Asia, but when my hon. friend urges me to give a full explanation as to what has been done and what it is intended to do he is rather asking for a statement of policy. The history of Asia Minor during the last few months has really been no history at all, and that certainly is, from the point of view of Her Majesty's Government, most desirable. Whatever might be the influence of our Consuls as a restraining force in those regions, we certainly desire nothing better for those regions than that they should enjoy quiet government, and that, as a matter of fact, there should be no call for the exercise of the influence of our Consuls. I have been strongly urged to make a statement with regard to the concession made to Russia in respect of railways in Asia Minor. That was an understanding between the Turkish and the Russian Governments, and it was, I believe, a self-denying ordinance on the part of Turkey to the effect that, if they did not make certain railways themselves, they would give the offer to another Power who was their neighbour. As far as the Government are concerned, they had no idea of any wholesale withdrawal of Consuls in Asia Minor, as has been suggested. We fully recognise the advantages which their presence has given, and, with due regard to the very heavy and increasing claims upon them, we hope to pursue the present policy with advantage.

Question put, and agreed to.

10. £167,186, to complete the sum for Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, and Uganda Railway.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he did not wish to repeat what he had said at an earlier period of the session on the subject of Uganda; he merely desired to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs when the Uganda Report was likely to be in their hands. It was most unfortunate that this Vote should be discussed before the Report was in the hands of the Committee.

*MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid we cannot give the right hon. Baronet any information upon that point, for this reason: Sir Harry Johnstone has been unfortunately laid up with an attack of fever, from which he is only just recovering, and this has delayed the writing of the Report. I very much doubt whether it will be ready in time for a discussion this session.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I hope I shall be in order in referring to the removal of the native troops from Uganda to Somaliland, and asking for the Papers relating to such removal.

*MR. BRODRICK: I do not think there are any Papers whatever in regard to this matter. The regiment is now in Somaliland.

Vote agreed to.

11. £256,955, to complete the sum for Colonial Services.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The Secretary of State for the Colonies is not present at the moment, and I do not know if there is any member of the Government who can answer the question I wish to put as to the number of cases where duties have been increased in the West Indies. We are granting money in aid of these colonies, and yet the traders are charged increased duties in some cases on British goods. The number of colonies in which the duties have been increased is not known to me, but I know of some that have been raised from 12 to 25 per cent.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The question which the right hon. Gentleman puts I am unable to answer; perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will put it down in the form of a question to the Colonial Secretary.

Vote agreed to.

12. £1,000, to complete the sum for Cyprus (Grant-in-aid).

*MR. PIERPOINT (Warrington) desired to know whether any progress had been made with regard to the conversion of the Crimean loan of 1855, a loan which intimately affected the question before the Committee. The arrangements for the conversion of the loan were come to two years ago, and although he had asked questions on various occasions with regard to the matter, he had never received more than a postponing answer. He desired to know whether the conversion of the loan would benefit Cyprus or not. He wished to know, first, whether the arrangements entered into two years ago for the conversion of the loan had been ratified, or whether they had been, or were going to be, considered, and whether the arrangement, if ratified, would have any good effect upon the island of Cyprus.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): In answer to the question, the hon. Gentleman, I think, is probably aware that negotiations have taken place between the Government and the Turkish Government. We have always been anxious to get terms which would be satisfactory, but up to the present we have not been able to obtain from the Porte the terms which we could accept. I do not think the case is quite hopeless; we have arrived nearly at an agreement, but at present all I can say is that no agreement has been arrived at, and I do not know that one will be arrived at in the immediate future. But I will point out to my hon. friend once more that I do not think this is a matter in which he is much interested. He is concerned on behalf of Cyprus, and I have told him before and I will tell him again, that if we made the best possible arrangement with the port as to the conversion of the loan it would not benefit Cyprus in the least.

*MR. PIERPOINT pointed out that whilst every year it was said there was a deficiency with regard to Cyprus, that fact arose through the island paying the debts of the Porte to France and to this country. Among the first things hypothecated to the repayment of the loan of 1855 were the customs duties of Smyrna and Syria and the balance of the Egyptian tribute. But the customs duties of Smyrna and Syria not being available, what had been done was to take the tribute from Cyprus, and from that pay the debt, the result being that for twenty years Cyprus had been paying the debt to this country and France. France benefited to the extent of £40,000 and this country to the extent of £10,000 a year. So that, in fact, instead of receiving, as was constantly said, £30,000 a year, Cyprus paid £60,000 to this country and to France.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I admire the tenacity of my hon. friend, and I fear it is hopeless to convince him, after what has taken place on previous occasions, that he is mistaken, and I would not refer to the expression he used at all but for the fact that these continual discussions are repeated in Cyprus, and have the effect there of making the people believe they are badly treated by Great Britain; and when a gentleman of the authority and position of my hon. friend confirms that statement it is difficult to persuade them that really the rule of Great Britain has been of enormous benefit and advantage. Therefore, I must repeat, Cyprus has no claim whatever in this matter. Cyprus was in the position of a tributary to the Porte. When we took over the island a commision was appointed to decide the average amount of the tribute. That was the liability which we took over with Cyprus. If we had nothing to do with Cyprus we would still be under the liability to pay this tribute to the Porte. It does not matter one brass farthing to Cyprus what becomes of the tribute after it has been collected. It has no concern in the distribution of the money. When we came into possession we undertook to pay this money to the Porte in the first instance, but it was convenient to intercept it for the payment of the debtors of the Porte; and therefore a large proportion of it went to France which now has a much better security for its debt, and we took the balance. The hon. Member said that this country made money out of Cyprus. That is absolutely a mistake. We do not make a farthing. On the contrary, Cyprus costs us every year a varying sum—£18,000 one year and £30,000 another year. And we do what the Porte could never have done. We are now engaged on harbour works, railway works, and irrigation works. We have pledged our credit for a sum of £60,000; and we are employed on experimental irrigation works which promise extremely well, and which I hope will justify a larger expenditure in future. The taxation has been rearranged, being made less arbitrary and oppressive; and although we have not done all that we might have done, we effected a considerable improvement in the condition of the island. In tribute, Cyprus does not pay one penny more to us than she would have done if the Porte still had authority in the island.

Vote then agreed to.

13. £14,350, to complete the sum for Subsidies to Telegraph Companies.

Mr. J. Chamberlain.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE said that in a recent debate which took place on the subject of telegraphs the strategic cables which were those subsidised, and which were the subject of this Vote, were the object of some remarks, and the Government were then asked whether their attention had been called to the desirability of landing the cables which joined us to them on the Irish coast, where the water was deep, rather than on the coast of Cornwall, where the water was for a long way out very shallow. Obviously it would be very much easier to cut a cable which was laid in shallow water than if the water was deep. He pointed out that the companies interested in the Vote had issued a circular in which they alleged that it was just as easy to cut a cable laid in deep water as in shallow, but in the recent debate he had not spoken without taking the highest opinion upon the subject, and that opinion was entirely and directly opposed to the opinion of the telegraph companies. He merely desired now to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury to call the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the First Lord of the Admiralty to the matter, so that they might consider the advisability of landing these cables on the Irish coast.

Mr. HANBURY: The question has been considered both by the Admiralty and the War Office not so much with regard to the cables to which the right hon. Baronet calls attention now, but with regard to the general question. The whole question of landing these cables in deep water has been considered.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn. It has long been the rule that Private Members' Orders should not be taken on an evening devoted to Supply, and I think that the same rule should apply to the Government Orders also.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Balfour*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at Eleven of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 18*th June*, 1900.

LORD INCHIQUIN.

Petition of Lucius William, Baron Inchiquin in the Peerage of Ireland, claiming a right to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland; read, and referred to the Lord Chancellor to consider and report thereupon to the House.

NEW PEER.

The Right Honourable Sir Richard Everard Webster, G.C.M.G., late Her Majesty's Attorney General, Keeper or Master of the Rolls and Records of the Court of Chancery in England, having been created Baron Alverstone of Alverstone in the Isle of Wight and county of Southampton—was (in the usual manner) introduced.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND.

Writs and Returns electing the Viscount Frankfort de Montmorency a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Lord Inchiquin, deceased; with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto. Delivered (on oath), and Certificate read.

SAT FIRST.

The Marquess of Winchester sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother.

TOOK THE OATH.

The Viscount Frankfort de Montmorency took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

Bradford Corporation.
Great Western Railway.
Baker Street and Waterloo Railway.

Also the Certificates that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3).
Metropolitan Common Scheme (Petersham) Provisional Order.

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—

Roe's Patent (Petition for Bill).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

WORKINGTON RAILWAYS AND DOCKS BILL [H.L.].

Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee.

MORECAMBE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (GAS) BILL.

A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

ALEXANDRA PARK (PETITION FOR BILL).

ROE'S PATENT (PETITION FOR BILL).

Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Friday next.

LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

Report of Her Majesty's Attorney General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE WATER BILL.

The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 1st and 28th of May last discharged, and Bill committed for Monday next.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 30th of April and the 28th of May last discharged, and Bill committed.

WALSALL CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

WIDNES AND RUNCORN BRIDGE BILL.

The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported with Amendments.

RAMSGATE CORPORATION IMPROVEMENTS BILL [H.L.].

The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

NOTTINGHAM CORPORATION BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

SOUTH LANCASHIRE TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LANCASHIRE, DERBYSHIRE, AND EAST COAST RAILWAY BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

LIVERPOOL OVERHEAD RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

SOUTHPORT WATER BILL.

HASTINGS HARBOUR BILL.

MAIDENHEAD GAS BILL.

Read 3^a, and passed.

HOYLAKE AND WEST KIRBY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

SOUTHPORT EXTENSION AND TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

FARNWORTH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE, COMMERCIAL GAS, AND SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS COMPANIES BILL.

HALIFAX CORPORATION BILL.

HUDDERSFIELD CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

JARROW AND HEBBURN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL.

LAMBETH WATER BILL.

LONDON AND SAINT KATHERINE DOCKS AND EAST AND WEST INDIA DOCK COMPANIES BILL.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL.

MID-KENT WATER BILL.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

PORTLAND URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

SOUTHPORT AND LYTHAM TRAM-ROAD BILL.

WANDSWORTH AND PUTNEY GAS BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

GLASTONBURY CORPORATION GAS BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

LEITH BURGH PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment.

DORKING WATER BILL [H.L.].

FISHGUARD WATER AND GAS BILL [H.L.].

MOUNTAIN ASH WATER BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

WITHINGTON URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Crofton be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Crawshaw; read, and agreed to.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [H.L.].

HAMILTON BURGH BILL.

HAMILTON, MOTHERWELL, AND WISHAW TRAMWAYS BILL.

AIRDRIE, COATBRIDGE, AND DISTRICT WATER TRUST BILL.

AIRDRIE AND COATRIDGE TRAMWAYS BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

LEE CONSERVANCY BILL.

Report from the Com [illegible] of Selection, That the Earl of Bu[illegible] be proposed to the House as [illegible] the Select Committee on the s[illegible]s in the place of the Earl of Lichfield; read, and agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (GAS) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 109.)

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [H.L.].

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 3) BILL [H.L.].

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 4) BILL [H.L.].

Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL [H.L.].

Committed to a Committee of the whole House.

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by Her Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Order of the House of the 17th February, 1896, viz:—

Trade Reports—

I. Annual Series—

No. 2436. United States (Trade of the Philippine Islands, 1899). (May 31.)

No. 2437. China (Pakhoi);
No. 2438. Italy (Genoa and District);
No. 2439. Netherlands (Amsterdam);
No. 2440. France (Pondicherry);
No. 2441. Turkey (Beirut and Coast of Syria);
No. 2442. Persia (Persian Gulf);
No. 2443. China (Swatow). (June 6.)

No. 2444. Japan (Yokohama);
No. 2445. Spain (Bilbao and District);
No. 2446. France (Dunkirk);
No. 2447. Russia (Taganrog);
No. 2448. Switzerland;
No. 2449. China (Hangchow). (June 11.)

II. Miscellaneous Series—

No. 526. Shipping and shipbuilding on the American lakes. (May 31.)

Malta.—Ordinance No. X. of 1898 (the Contagious Diseases Law). (May 31.)

Metropolitan Water Supply (Royal Commission).—Minutes of evidence takén before Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the water supply within the limits of the Metropolitan Water Companies. Vol. II. (June 6.)

Army (Volunteers).—Annual Return for 1899. (June 7.)

Fisheries (Scotland). — Eighteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1899—

Part II. Report on Salmon Fisheries. (June 8);
Part III. Scientific Investigations. (June 12.)

Local Taxation (Royal Commission).—Minutes of evidence and appendix. Vol. IV. (June 8.)

Board of Education—

1. South-Eastern Division. General Report for the year 1899, by I. W. Danby, Esq., Chief Inspector.
2. East Central Division. General Report for the year 1899, by Reverend C. D. Du Port, Chief Inspector. (June 8.)
3. Report to the Board of Education of the Proceedings of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales under the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869 to 1889, for the year 1899. (June 12.)
4. Minutes sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the counties of—
   - I. Warwick (sixth minute);
   - II. Glamorgan (ninth minute). (June 12.)
5. Associations constituted under the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897;
6. Associated schools and amounts of aid grant paid;
7. Unassociated schools and amounts of aid grant paid. (June 16.)

India (Famine).—Papers regarding the famine and the relief operations in India during 1899-1900. Vol. I. British Districts. Vol. II. Native States. (June 15.)

Patent Office.—Report of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to consider various suggestions which have been made for developing the benefits afforded by the Patent Office to inventors. (June 15.)

Irish Land Commission—

1. (Proceedings.) Return for the month of February, 1900.
2. (Rules.) Rules, dated 21st May, under the Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Act, 1899, section 2. (June 15.)

Loan Fund Board (Ireland).—Sixty-second Annual Report, for 1899. (June 15.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

ARMY.

I. (Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances).—List of exceptions to the Army Regulations sanctioned during the year ended 31st March, 1900.

II. (Volunteer Rifle Ranges).—Grants which it is proposed to make out of the sum of £40,000 taken for this purpose in the Military Works Loan, 1899.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 2450. Germany (Grand Duchy of Baden)

No. 2451. Spain (Canary Islands).
No. 2452. Netherlands (Java).
No. 2453. Tripoli.
No. 2454. Brazil (Porto Alegre).
No. 2455. Denmark.
No. 2456. Turkey (Bengazi).
No. 2457. China (Wuhu).
No. 2458. Italy (Elba).
No. 2459. Turkey (Baghdad).
No. 2460. Spain (Trade of Barcelona for the year 1899).

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1899.

DUBLIN HOSPITALS.

Forty-second Report of the Board of Superintendence, with appendices for the years 1899-1900.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Orders in Council of the 15th May, 1900—

1. Approving certain pilotage byelaws made by the Humber Pilotage Commissioners.

2. Recognising in this country certificates of free board (load line) issued by the Government of South Australia to vessels registered in that Colony.

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875.

Order in Council of the 15th May, 1900, declaring that acetylene in admixture with air or oxygen gas shall be deemed to be an explosive within the meaning of the Explosives Act, 1875.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) (DIETARIES).

Rules made by the Secretary for Scotland under the Prisons (Scotland) Act, 1877, establishing new rates of dietaries for the several classes of prisoners.

INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).

Statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1898-99. Thirty-fifth Number.

SUPERANNUATION—TREASURY MINUTES.

I. Declaring that the following persons were appointed without Civil Service certificates through inadvertence on the part of the Heads of their Departments, viz.:—John Roberts, turnkey, Consular Gaol, Yokohama Consular Service; James Alfred Dawson, rural postman, Post Office Department.

II. Declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Sanitary Surveyor under the Board of Trade (Mercantile Marine Services) professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service are required.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Returns relating to the Council up to the 31st March, 1900; with estimate of expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1901.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853 TO 1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Licence granted by Her Majesty to Elizabeth Martin, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting the said Elizabeth Martin to be at large on condition that she enter the Royal Victoria Home, Horfield, near Bristol.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER).

Orders made by the County Council of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dividing the Parliamentary divisions of Heywood, Leigh, and Stretford into convenient polling districts.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which examinations for 1900 shall be held.

PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND.)

Return from the City Marshal of Dublin for the year ended 31st December, 1899.

INCLOSURES, ETC., EXPENSES ACT, 1868.

Fees to be taken in respect of transactions under the Tithe and other Acts, in accordance with the provisions of the Inclosure, etc., Expenses Act, 1868.

HARWICH HARBOUR.

Abstract of Accounts of receipts and expenditure of Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board, to 31st day of March, 1900, with report on proceedings, etc.

FINES, ETC. (IRELAND).

Abstract of the Accounts of fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks for the year 1898.

DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1865.

Accounts of receipts and expenditure under the Act for the year 1899.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.

Statutes made by the Governing Bodies of—

- I. St. John's College, Oxford, on 9th December, 1899, amending Statutes III. 1, III. 14, V. 4 (a), and XV. 2, of the Statutes of the College.
- II. Worcester College, Oxford, on 24th January, 1900, amending Statute III. 16 of the Statutes of the College.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 107.)

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.

Scheme for the management of the charity of William Price, in the parish of Fareham, in the county of Southampton, founded by will dated 24th August, 1721. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 108.)

RICHMOND BRIDGE.

Account for the year 1899. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CHINA — ANTI-FOREIGN DISTURBANCES—RECENT OPERATIONS.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Seeing the noble Marquess at the head of the Government in his place, I wish to ask him whether he can give us the latest news of the state of affairs in China.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): I do not think we have any news which I can call of an interesting character. The Admiral has come back to Tientsin—this news comes through the Japanese boats—and we do not know exactly what grounds he had for coming back or what his intentions are. Also the Taku forts have been attacked, as I think your Lordships have seen in the newspapers, but we have not received any information of any result from that movement. I very much wish I could give the noble Earl fuller information, because it is naturally a matter which has created everywhere the utmost anxiety, both in this country and others. At present all we have been able to do is to inform those who represent us that their discretion is absolute, and to forward as many troops as we can.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, this is a Bill which has been before your Lordships on more than one occasion, and has passed through this House, but has not become law simply for lack of time to consider it in another place. It does not, therefore, require so full an explanation as might have been necessary if the Bill had been entirely new. On the contrary, there is very little that is new in it. I need not say much about the first three clauses, the second clause being an interpretation clause and the third merely a repetition of the law as it at present stands. The fourth clause deals with a matter which is rather troublesome to the clergy, and it has already been agreed to by your Lordships. At present there are two rubrics relating to the publication of banns of marriage which are somewhat inconsistent with one another, and it is sometimes thought that the clergy are bound by the one rubric and sometimes it is thought by the other. There is one rubric after the Nicene Creed which speaks of the proper time for publishing banns of marriage as immediately after that creed; and there is another rubric before the form of service for marriage which speaks of the proper time for the publication of banns as immediately after the Second Lesson. But it has never been settled in a court of law which of the two is the right interpretation. It is not really worth while to insist upon either, and this clause—which provides that the time for publishing banns shall be on Sundays, not earlier than the hour of nine in the morning after the Nicene Creed, or after the Second Lesson at Morning Prayer; and that if there is no Morning Prayer or Holy Communion the banns shall be published at Evening Prayer—will get rid of the difficulty by leaving it to the clergy themselves to decide what is the proper time for the publication of banns. To this I cannot conceive that there can be any objection. The fifth clause empowers the two Archbishops, with the consent of the Convocations and subject to the approval of Her Majesty the Queen, to alter the rubrics to correspond with what the Bill proposes to enact. The sixth clause is the most operative part of the Bill. It proposes that when the banns shall have been published, in the same way as they are published now, the marriage may be solemnised at any church in the diocese wherein the banns have been published. At present the marriage must be solemnised in the church in which the banns have been published; or, if they have been published in two churches, as is very often the case, in one of those two churches. But this has been found to give rise to great inconvenience, and there is now no reason for maintaining the restriction. It is thought very much better that it should be left open to the parties who desire to be married to go to any church in the diocese they choose where the minister is willing to celebrate the marriage. In applying for the banns to be published the parties will have to state in what church they propose to get married. There can, therefore, be no concealment in the matter, and there is absolutely no danger of a clandestine marriage resulting from the restriction being repealed. The restriction was introduced in 1723 by the well-known Act of Lord Hardwicke, and has continued to the present day. Before Lord Hardwicke's Act it was open to persons desirous of being married to go to any other church in the diocese than that in which the banns had been pnblished, and I think it is better on the whole that we should go back to that practice, now that the need for the restriction has passed away. Clause 7 deals with marriages of seamen, who are frequently put to considerable inconvenience owing to there being no recognised mode of publishing their banns. Often a sailor comes home and wishes to marry immediately, because, soon after, he will have to leave on another voyage. This clause provides that the banns of a seaman may be published in any church of the parish in which he usually dwells when not at sea, or, if his ship be in port, in any church within five miles of the ship. The eighth clause requires the parties applying for the publication of their banns to make a definite statement in writing containing those necessary particulars which hitherto the clergyman, generally speaking, has had to ascertain for himself. This will be a great relief to the clergyman. The ninth clause deals with marriage by licence, and provides that a marriage may be solemnised upon a licence duly issued from the registry of the Archbishop or Bishop of the diocese, and whether granted in the registry or through a surrogate, in any church within the diocese, provided one of the parties to be married under such licence shall have had his or her usual place of abode within the diocese for fifteen days before the granting of the licence, or upon a licence duly issued from the registry of an archdeaconry—which is allowable in certain cases—in any church in any archdeaconry where such licences have been hitherto issued. In short, it gives the same liberty in respect to marriages by licence as Clause 6 gives in respect to marriages by banns. The tenth clause deals with marriages of seamen by licence, and the eleventh clause simply preserves the right of the Master of the Faculties and the Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Canterbury to grant licences. Under the twelth clause applicants are required to state precisely the names, descriptions, and usual place or places of abode of both parties and the name of the church in which the marriage is intended to be solemnised. When it is proposed to solemnise the marriage in a church in a parish in which neither of the parties have had his or her usual place of abode for fifteen days immediately before the granting of the licence, on the day such licence is granted notice will have to be sent by the person who obtained it to the minister of the church in which the marriage is to be solemnised. The fourteenth clause provides for the marriage of persons residing in canal or river boats or other movable dwellings, and proposes that, where either of the persons to be married shall be residing in a movable dwelling, the banns may be published in a church or chapel of the ecclesiastical parish in which the movable dwelling is at the time of the first publication of the banns, and a licence may be granted for the marriage of such person in any church or chapel in the diocese in which the movable dwelling is at the time of the granting of the licence. The fifteenth clause is a very important one, because it fixes the fees for marriages. In fixing the fees it is, of course, to be understood that there is no desire to prevent the parties who are married from giving very much more than the fee which is required of them. That is done at present in a very large number of cases, and there is no reason to discourage the practice. But at the same time it is of some importance that the fee which can be legally demanded should be the same in the church as in the registration office. There can be no question that in certain cases people do go to the registration office rather than to the church, because the fees in the church of the parish where they live are higher than the fees in the registration office. The sixteenth clause is nothing more than a repetition of the law at it is at present, and the next clause provides that any false statement made knowingly by the parties shall be punishable as a misdemeanour. It is at present difficult to deal with false statements because they are not always reduced to writing. I have had some rather bad cases in which licences particularly have been obtained by false affidavits, and I have found that it was not possible to deal with these false affidavits at all. Clause 18 reserves the right of the Royal Family, and Clause 19 simply repeals certain clauses in former Acts which will be inconsistent with this Act. Of course, the clause might be omitted altogether, because this Act will repeal the clauses referred to *ipso facto*; but it is better that they should be distinctly inserted in order that the clergy may know exactly how these clauses stand. I believe, my Lords, that the Bill, if passed, will be of considerable advantage in many ways, that it will get rid of a great deal of friction, and that it will remove much discomfort and distress; and I feel very confident that nothing in it will give rise to any kind of abuse. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I rise, not for the purpose of asking your Lordships to reject this Bill, but to preserve my right to criticise the Bill in Committee. The marriage laws of the country are so extremely important that without great consideration we ought not to alter them. I think the most rev. Prelate has undervalued the effect of Lord Hardwicke's Act, which was passed to get rid of a mischievous and scandalous state of the law, and to remove a number of evils to which it is not necessary now to allude. I confess that I have some doubt about the repeal of that part of Lord Hardwicke's Act to which the most rev. Prelate has referred. The whole object of publishing the banns in the churches in which the marriage is to be solemnised is to give information to those who are likely to know the parties who are going to be married. The most rev. Prelate now proposes to get rid of that provision. He proposes in the Bill that the parties shall state the church in which the marriage shall be solemnised, but he gets rid of the obligation to do it. There is no fortifying, as it were, of the provisions of the Bill. I cannot say at present that I have made up my mind whether or not this is too important an alteration of the law to be allowed to pass, but it is an alteration which requires very careful consideration.

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: This is a matter which might well be considered in Committee of the full House, and I move that the Standing Committee be negatived.

Moved, "That the Standing Committee be negatived."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: As Chairman of the Standing Committee I should deprecate very much a Bill of this kind not going to that Committee. In my opinion it is a Bill which it is very desirable should be considered by the Standing Committee.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I agree with the noble Earl. I do not think the motion is one to which the House can agree.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

BURIAL AUTHORITIES (CREMATION) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, this is a Bill to enable burial authorities to provide and maintain places and necessary appliances for cremation. There are several safeguards introduced in the Bill. In the first place, the plans of places for cremation must be approved by the Secretary of State, who must also approve of all the bye-laws to be made under this Bill, and after having approved of them he may at any time require them to be submitted to him for revision or modification. It is proposed in the Bill that the bye-laws shall prescribe in what cases, in what mode, and under what conditions cremation may take place, and may prescribe the forms of the certificates and declarations to be given or made before cremation is permitted to take place. Clause 6 provides penalties for a breach of the bye-laws; Clause 7 deals with fees, which are to be approved by the Secretary of State; and the last clause provides that the Act shall not interfere with the jurisdiction of any coroners under the Coroners Act, 1887, or any Act amending the same, nor authorise the Burial Board or other local authority to create or permit a nuisance. The principle of cremation has been sanctioned over and over again by the Legislature, and all that this Bill proposes to do is to enable burial authorities to raise rates for the purpose of cremation without having to go to Parliament for a private Act. If no question of rating is involved cremation is perfectly legal at present. The principle of burning the bodies of dead persons is certainly gaining ground in public favour. The corporations of Manchester, Glasgow, Liverpool, and Hull have already obtained private Acts giving them powers to provide and maintain places for the carrying out of cremation, and at the present moment the corporation of the City of London have a Bill before your Lordships' House in which they ask for similar powers. I am informed that the revenue from cremations is steadily increasing, so much so that the Cremation Society now possesses a moderate surplus. I have been asked whether the Act is intended to apply to Scotland or Ireland. As the Bill at present stands, I think it would not so apply, because it merely amends the Burial Acts, and I am unable to discover any Burial Acts which apply to Scotland or Ireland of the kind dealt with in this Bill. But if it is thought better I will, in Committee, consent to an Amendment taking Scotland and Ireland specifically out of the purview of the Bill. The Bill is supported by the London County Council and is not treated by them as a party matter, both parties having approved of its principle.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: This Bill raises very serious questions, and involves some considerations which may be local and some which are of a wide general character. I do not rise to oppose the Bill. On the contrary, it seems to me that this is a question on which there ought to be some general law to regulate cremations, whether carried out by private Act or not; and in any Act passed on the subject, of course it would be understood that, being an Act of general operation, it would overrule those cremation Acts which have already been obtained. All the provisions of this Bill will have to be very carefully considered.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House adjourned at Five of the clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 18th June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—

Barnsley Corporation Bill [Lords].
Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Bill [Lords].
Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords].
Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill [Lords].
Margate Corporation Bill [Lords].
Mersey Railway Bill [Lords].
Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill [Lords].

North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords].
Rotherham Corporation Bill [Lords].
South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [Lords].
Westgate and Birchington Water Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—

Roe's Patent Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have not been complied with, viz. :—

North Eastern Railway Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Brighton and Preston United District, &c.) Bill [Lords].
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of the Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill.
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.
Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

FARNWORTH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE, COMMERCIAL GAS, AND SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS COMPANIES BILL.

Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

GREAT BERKHAMPSTEAD WATER BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

HUDDERSFIELD CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

JARROW AND HEBBURN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

LANCASHIRE INEBRIATES ACTS BOARD BILL [Lords].

MENSTONE WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

MID-KENT WATER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

NEWPORT CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

NEWTOWN AND LLANLLWCHAIARN URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

PORTLAND URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

WANDSWORTH AND PUTNEY GAS BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

BIRMINGHAM (KING EDWARD THE SIXTH) SCHOOLS BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

BLACKPOOL, ST. ANNE'S, AND LYTHAM TRAMWAYS BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

COWES PIER BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

GREAT CENTRAL RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

HALIFAX CORPORATION BILL.

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL.

As amended, considered; Amendments made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

LONDON AND SAINT KATHERINE DOCKS AND EAST AND WEST INDIA DOCK COMPANIES BILL.

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MOTHERWELL WATER BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11) BILL.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL [ANNUITIES].

Consider ed in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the creation of Annuities to be charged on and payable out of the Revenues of India in lieu of the sum of money amounting to £34,859,217 17s. 6d. agreed upon for the purchase by the Secretary of State in Council of India of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, and the payment of any costs and expenses incurred by the said Secretary of State under any Act of the present Session for vesting the said undertaking in the said Secretary of State in Council of India; and also any costs, charges, and expenses of obtaining and passing the said Act not provided by the surplus profits arising from the said undertaking for the half year ending the 30th day of June, 1900."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I should like an explanation of this. It is the first time we have seen or heard anything of it, and we have no explanation of it. A doubt arises in my mind whether there is not a shifting of liability with regard to this matter on to the funds of the United Kingdom.

No one rising to reply,

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said: I move to report Progress. It is impossible to proceed without some explanation.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Amendment to—Otley Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]: Amendments to—Cork, Bandon, and South Coast Railway Bill [Lords], Higham Ferrers Water Bill [Lords], Cleethorpes Gas Bill [Lords], Dundee Harbour Bill [Lords], London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [Lords], without amendment.

OLDHAM CORPORATION BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section B), with Amendments; [Costs awarded]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

BRITISH MUSEUM BILL.

Petition from Worcestershire, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

DOULATH KHAN.

Petition of Doulath Khan, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Winning Park; Ardrossan; Haddington; Stirling; Renfrew; Pollokshaws; Bathgate; Crail; Anstruther Easter; Kilrenny; Dalkeith; and Aberbrothock; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Stirling, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Aberdeen, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EXECUTORS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Petitions against, from Limehouse; and St. George's, Hanover Square; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petition from Sheffield, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Kington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY BILL.

Petition from Sheffield, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HOUSES (SCOTLAND) LATER OPENING BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petitions against establishment, from Brechin; Fraserburgh; and Montrose; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Ellwood; Kingsclere; Woodlands; Bideford; Pill; and Holbeach; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against, from Wakefield; Swansea; and Huddersfield; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Bleasby Moor; North Willingham; Bridgwater; Exeter; Fletchertown; Huddersfield (four); Lambeth; Birmingham (three); Bedford; Brixton Hill; Louth; Upper Norwood; Barnstaple; Woodhouse; Hillsbro'; Spotland (two); Rochdale; Eccup; Shepshed; Winchester; East Brighton; Sheerness; Diss; Glasgow (two); Dewsbury (two); Canterbury; East Cornwall; Pill; Gateshead-on-Tyne; Ipswich; Matlock; Aberffrwd; West Norwood; Bideford; Durham; Redhill; Barnstaple; Wolverhampton; Kilmarnock; Tulse Hill; Appledore; Sittingbourne; Maryport; Clifton; Westbury Park; Bosworth; Stapleton; Woolwich; Howden-le-Wear; Cleveland; Holbeach (three); Taunton (three); Upper Bont; Muswell Hill; Golcar; Delph; Bath (two); East Bristol; Garth Maesteg; Maesteg; Resolven; Brighouse; Queensbury; Stratford (two); Llantrissant; Barry Dock; Bristol (twelve); Luton; St. George (two); Fishponds; Shettleston; Lochgelly; Levern; Henley; Wells; Scarborough; Brynamman; Llandebie (two); Llanedi; Kingsclere; Woodlands; Llannon; Stockton-on-Tees; Manordilo; Ealing; Carmarthen; Newcastle; Barton upon Irwell; Barnsley (five); Rotherham; Dartford; Halifax; Ash; Adisham; Yardley; Cleveland; Uxbridge (two); Kingsdown; Pontlottyn; Hebburn Colliery; South Shields; St. Neots; Cricklewood; Kensington; London; York; Bexley; Warmley (seven); Lonwells Green; Warmley Tower (four); Siston Common (three); Kingswood; Wallsend on Tyne; Wincobank; St. Davids; Folkestone; Llansawel; Llanlluan; Gateshead; Wigan (two); Sheffield (six); Reigate; Malvern; Wrexham; and Higham on the Hill; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Largs; Keith; Dumfries; Dalbeattie; Campbeltown; Pittenweem; Ardrossan; Glasgow (two); Aylesford; Darvel; Arbroath; St. Andrews; Cramond; and Dundee (six); to lie upon the Table.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS ON ACTIVE SERVICE.

Petitions for legislation, from Sheffield; and Dartford; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Llansawel; Garth Maesteg; Bristol; Maesteg; Hay Mills; Kingsclere Woodlands; Scarborough; Brynamman; Llandebie (two); Llanedi; Manordilo; Shettleston; Northfield; London; Bath; Sheffield (three); Ash; Wallsend; St. Neots; Pontlottyn; York; Bridgwater; North Wellingham; Bleasby Moor; Hillsbro'; Eccup; Birmingham; Spotland (two); Winchester; Sheerness; Rochdale; Bedford; Gateshead-on-Tyne; South Devon; Glasgow; Redhill; Bideford (two); Wolverhampton; Llanbadarn Upper; Durham; Woolwich; Pill; Taunton (two); Brixton Hill; Bargoed; Liverpool; Pontypridd; Higham on the Hill; Llanarthney; St. David's; Gateshead; Wrexham; and Wigan (two); to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Garth Maesteg; Brynamman; Llannon; Llandebie (two); Llanedi; Manordilo; Pembroke Dock; Pen Buallt; Pontlottyn; Maesteg; Pontnewynydd; Aberffrwd; Upper Bont; St. David's; and Llanlluan; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).

Paper [presented 15th June] to be printed. [No. 207.]

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Copy presented, of Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 208.]

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 209.]

RAILWAYS.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade on an Application made during the year 1899 under the Railway Companies' Powers Act, 1864, and of the Proceedings of the Board of Trade with respect thereto [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 210.]

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES).

Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations sanctioned during the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (VOLUNTEER RIFLE RANGES).

Copy presented, of Grants which it is proposed to make out of the sum of £40,000 taken for this purpose in the Military Works Loan, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 15th June; *Mr. Jesse Collings*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 211.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2450 to 2460 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DUBLIN HOSPITALS.

Copy presented, of Forty-second Report of the Board of Superintendence, with Appendices, for the year 1899-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1865.

Account presented, of the Receipts and expenditure under the Act for the year 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 212.]

FINES, ETC. (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Abstract Accounts of Fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks for 1898 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 213.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 15th May, 1900, approving certain Pilotage Bye-laws made by the Humber Pilotage Commissioners [by Act] to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 15th May, 1900, recognising in this Country Certificates of Free Board (Load Line) issued by the Government of South Australia to Vessels registered in that Colony [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of St. John's College, Oxford, on 9th December, 1899, amending Statutes III. 1, III. 14, V. 4a, and XV. 2, of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 214.]

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Worcester College, Oxford, on 24th January, 1900, amending Statute III. 16 of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 215.]

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 15th May, 1900, declaring that Acetylene, in admixture with air or oxygen gas, shall be deemed to be an explosive within the meaning of the Explosives Act, 1875 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).

Copy presented, of Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE OBSERVATORY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Richmond Bridge.—Cash Account for the year 1899 [by Act].

EAST INDIA RAILWAYS (PURCHASE).

Address for "Copy of any Correspondence between the India Office and the Bank of England regarding the rate of interest to be adopted in the calculation of the annuities for the purchase of the East Indian Railway, the Eastern Bengal Railway, the Scinde, Punjab, and Delhi Railway, and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, respectively."—(*Mr. Cohen.*)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

MERCHANT SHIPPING, 1899.

Copy ordered, "of Tables showing the progress of British Merchant Shipping."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

MARRIAGE ACT, 1898.

Return ordered, "giving the following particulars of the results of the Marriage Act, 1898, during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900—

"1. Number of 'registered buildings' for which 'authorised persons' have been appointed under Section 6 of the Act, classified according to religious denominations as follows: Wesleyan Methodists, Primitive Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, other denominations;

"2. Number of 'authorised persons' so appointed;

"3. Number of marriages which have taken place under the Act;

4. "Number of cases in which there have been serious irregularities by 'authorised persons' in connection with the marriage certificates."—(*Mr. Price.*)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—SIEGE OF LADYSMITH—CLAIM AGAINST THE MAYOR.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Imperial authorities have presented a bill for several thousands of pounds to the Mayor of Ladysmith for food for the inhabitants during the siege; and whether payment is to be insisted upon.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I have no information on the matter.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the hon. Gentleman obtain the information?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think so. This is a matter well within the competence of the commanding officers in South Africa. It seems to me, on the face of it, to be a mere question of bookkeeping. Clearly an officer cannot issue stores to civilians without entering the fact. The whole question of indemnity is a very large one, and will, I am sure, be considered in a generous spirit later on.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will put down another question later.

CASUALTY LISTS—4TH SHERWOOD FORESTERS MILITIA.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if the casualty list of the 4th Sherwood Foresters Militia Battalion has been received; and, if so, when it will be published.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Some of the casualties were published on the 12th June and some on the 16th June. A complete list has not yet been forwarded from South Africa, but it will be published as soon as it arrives, in conformity with uniform practice.

MR. YOXALL: Will the hon. Gentleman, seeing that these casualties took place eleven days ago, wire out for those affecting the rank and file?

*MR. WYNDHAM: The only effect of doing so would be probably to cause further delay. These casualties are collected and telegraphed with the utmost possible expedition, and the hon. Member must remember that for four days we could get no information at all from Lord Roberts.

FARQUHAR'S FARM ENGAGEMENT—STRENGTH OF THE 60TH RIFLES.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether a field-state showing the numbers and composition of the battalion of the 60th Rifles engaged at Farquhar's Farm, near Lombard's Kop, on Monday, the 31st October, is in the possession of the War Office; what number of officers was present with the battalion; and how many of them had been with the battalion for at least two years.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I am unable to give the right hon. Member this information, as the field-states are not sent to the War Office.

SETTLEMENT OF SOLDIERS IN SOUTH AFRICA AFTER THE WAR.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any arrangement has been made for the settlement of properly qualified soldiers in South Africa at the close of the present war; and, if so, whether it is proposed to form any organisation in South Africa for the purpose of giving effect to the intentions of the Government in this respect.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The matter is receiving the earnest consideration of Her Majesty's Government. I am in communication with Sir A. Milner on the subject, and an inter-Departmental Committee is about to be appointed with representatives of the War Office, Treasury, and Colonial Office, to deal with the subject.

OFFICERS' ESTATES AND THE DEATH DUTIES.

GENERAL RUSSELL (Cheltenham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Government have come to any decision regarding the remission of the death duties to widows of those officers who have lost their lives in the service of their country during the present war.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The hon. Member will find the result of the consideration of this subject embodied in section 14 of the Finance Act of this year.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—EXTENSION TO NAVAL AND MILITARY SERVANTS—WAR RELIEF FUNDS COMMITTEE.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the need to make adequate provision for the widows and orphans of soldiers killed in the war, he can now state the steps the Government propose to take in pursuance of the resolution of the House of 1st May, 1900.*

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Government quite recognise the necessity for further arrangements making adequate provision for the widows of soldiers and sailors. They propose to take immediate steps to frame a scheme for carrying out that object.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): Will the House be afforded an opportunity of discussing the recommendations of Lord Justice Collins's Committee? You propose to take the opportunity I have obtained for to-morrow.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no doubt every hon. Member would be tolerant of his day being taken away if another were found for him; but to set apart a day for the discussion of this Report would be an exceptional proceeding, which I do not feel justified, in the circumstances, in taking.

MR. KEARLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman give us the opportunity of discussing the proposals he intends to submit to the House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If they are submitted to the House there will be an opportunity for discussing the Government proposals, but I can make no promise with regard to them.

PENSIONS FOR DISCHARGED WOUNDED AND SICK SOLDIERS.

SIR J. LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will inform the House to what extent the powers of the Chelsea Commissioners have been enlarged recently to admit of a higher scale of pension being accorded to men incapacitated by wounds or disease contracted on service.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): At the same time may I ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state what bonus, gratuity, or pension soldiers invalided home through wounds or sickness receive on their discharge from the service.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxii., p. 489.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The cases of all soldiers discharged on account of wounds or sickness are decided by the Chelsea Commissioners, who assign pensions according to the nature of the injury, the soldier's rank, and the duration of his service, within the rates laid down by the Pay Warrant. These rates, for non-commissioned officers and men wholly disabled by wounds, run from 1s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. a day; for men partially disabled, from 6d. to 3s. a day. The recent extension of the powers of the Chelsea Commissioners refers only to cases of men disabled by disease. Formerly the rates of pension which could be granted in such cases depended entirely on rank and length of service, and the maximum for a private was 8d. a day. By Army Order 75, issued on the 1st of April, the maximum was raised to 1s. for privates, and the Chelsea Commissioners were empowered to determine the rate in accordance with the circumstances of each case.

TRAINED DOGS FOR OUTPOST DUTY.

GENERAL RUSSELL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that for a number of years past in several Continental armies numbers of dogs have been specially trained for the purpose of assisting in outpost duty, and whether, in view of the repeated cases of surprises that have occurred during the present war, the Government will seriously consider the expediency of following in this respect the example of these foreign military powers.

*MR. WYNDHAM: This proposal will be carefully examined in addition to others which the experience of the war has suggested.

RESERVE OF ARMS.

MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the 2nd Volunteer Battalion Wiltshire Regiment, H Company, who are now 142 strong as against 70 last year, have only 80 rifles at present, and whether, seeing that the adjutant indented for extra rifles early in April, he will receive them without further delay in order that the drill may be efficiently conducted.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The demand for these arms was only sent to Weedon on the 8th instant, and the arms have now been despatched. The delay was caused by the neglect of a clerk in the Ordnance Office in the Southern District, and he has been punished.

MR. WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Will the hon. Gentleman see that the Royal Reserves are armed before any more rifles are issued to the Volunteers?

*MR. WYNDHAM: There seems to be some misunderstanding. There is an ample supply of rifles in the country, although the issue may in some cases have been delayed owing to application having been made in the wrong quarter.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Is it not the fact that in consequence of not having received their rifles the Royal Reserves were unable to parade on the Queen's birthday?

*MR. WYNDHAM: Some of these regiments were only formed a few days before the Queen's birthday.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: For one year.

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT FATALITIES—ARMY CLOTHING.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state what were the losses amongst the troops engaged in the field day at Aldershot last Monday, how many hours the troops were engaged in the operations during the excessive heat, what rations were served out to them during the day, and whether the Commander-in-Chief at Aldershot was with the troops on that day; and whether, in future, care will be taken that troops in ordinary uniform and with head gear unsuitable as a protection from the sun shall not engage in field days during the excessive heat.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The General Officer commanding at Aldershot was with the troops. On the other points in the question I must refer my hon. friend to the full reply I gave to similar questions put on Friday, the 15th instant.† As I mentioned then, each regiment engaged in the operation has been called on to report what arrangements were made both for giving the men breakfast before they started and for providing refreshments during the day; and the following has been received from the General Officer commanding at Aldershot—

---

† See page 144 of this volume.

"With reference to your telegram of the 16th June, 1900, I have the honour to report as follows:—

"1. Reports received from commanding officers state that all men had breakfast before starting for the field day on the 11th inst.

"2. Light refreshments were actually supplied and carried by every unit, some in the haversack, but in the majority of cases in transport carts.

"3. The only units that did not receive their refreshments on the 'cease fire' sounding were the 5th Worcester Regiment and the 4th Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers.

"In the case of the 5th Worcester Regiment the officer commanding reports that the cart conveying the refreshments went astray during the operations.

"As regards the 4th Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers, the commanding officer reports that a contractor had undertaken to supply the battalion with bread and cheese. At the hour of the departure of the battalion he failed to appear. A mule cart was then loaded with the refreshments, but, owing to the driver not being acquainted with the locality in which the operations took place, the cart unfortunately did not turn up."

MR. JEFFREYS: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that at the inquest on one of the men it was stated that the contractor had orders to take out supplies but failed to do so, that another cart was then sent out to try and find the contractor, which also failed, and that certainly in the case of one regiment, if not more, no food was supplied.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I suppose that that regiment is one of the two referred to.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): May I ask whether the final decision of the Secretary of State upon the whole of the business will be laid on the Table of the House before the Vote is taken for the War Office.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I do not quite understand what the right hon. Gentleman means by the final decision.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I understood the Secretary of State had instituted an inquiry into the circumstances and called for a report, upon which I presume the noble Marquess will express an opinion.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I imagine that the matter is narrowed down to two points—namely, headdress—as to which I gave information on Friday—and light refreshments, as to which I have just given information.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: Is there to be no further statement in explanation of the catastrophe?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I shall be pleased to expand my statement if the right hon. Gentleman will indicate on what lines he wishes me to proceed. I do not see that I have anything to add.

*SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): With regard to the question of headdress, may I ask whether the old forage cap of the British Army was not capable of having a sunshade put over it, and whether the troops did not go all over India at the time of the Mutiny with that headdress.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The questions are now developing into a debate.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is there to be no inquiry into the circumstances, and no court-martial?

MR. JEFFREYS: Will the contractor who failed to carry out his contract be punished in any way?

*MR. WYNDHAM: There has been an inquiry, and it is for the House to determine whether that inquiry was not sufficiently exhaustive. For my part I feel that we are departing very widely from decentralisation by taking out of the hands of the officers in command matters with which they are perfectly competent to deal. I think we should risk much in assuming that any officer in command does not realise to the full the great responsibility which rests upon him.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): Did not the same thing happen in 1878?

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle) also rose and put a question.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question on the Paper has already been fully answered.

MILITIA OFFICERS' TRAINING ALLOWANCES.

MR. LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the mess allowance of 4s. a day, hitherto granted to quartermasters of Militia during the period of annual training, has been withdrawn on the embodiment of their regiments; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that these officers are put to much extra expense on being detached from their permanent stations, the Secretary of State for War can see his way to authorise the allowance to be granted in the same manner as during the annual training period.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I must refer my hon. friend to a reply to a similar question put by my hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Pembroke and Haverfordwest District on the 17th May.† I then explained that the mess allowance was inadmissible, but that a money grant as compensation for disturbance would be considered; and on the 26th of May‡ Lord Lansdowne stated in another place that he proposed to make such a grant. The details have not yet been settled.

MR. WARNER: Does that apply to adjutants?

*MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, to all the permanent staff.

CHANNEL FLEET—VISIT TO SHETLAND.

SIR LEONARD LYELL (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty will he explain why, although a portion of the German fleet has repeatedly visited Shetland in the course of its summer cruise, and quite recently a squadron of warships, including several large battleships, spent several days in Lerwick Harbour, where a body of our Naval Reserve men get their training, British warships of any size hardly ever visit Shetland, and are believed to purposely avoid navigating the seas there; whether he will take steps so that the Royal Naval Reserve men of Shetland shall have an opportunity of seeing a British fleet, and not derive their ideas of a Navy solely from foreign fleets; and will he order the Channel Fleet to visit Shetland this year in the course of its summer cruise, a visit which has been often asked for in past years.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): Although Lerwick has not been visited by the Channel Squadron of late years the Training Squadron has frequently done so, the last three occasions being 1895, 1896, 1899. Kirkwall, which possesses a better and more convenient harbour, seems to have been preferred by the officers commanding the Channel Squadron during their visits to northern waters. It is possible that the Squadron, or a portion of it, may visit Lerwick when the Squadron is again in the north, but I can give no undertaking that an opportunity will occur during the present year. I may remind the hon. Gentleman of my answer to a similar question last year, that the visits of Her Majesty's ships to particular ports must be determined by service considerations alone.

ASHANTI—NATIVE RISING—INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall) had on the Paper the following question:—To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can say who is responsible for the deficiency both of provisions and ammunition among the British garrison of Coomassie; and whether he can state why a larger relief force was not despatched to Coomassie over a month ago. The hon. Member was not, however, in his place to put it.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think this question ought to remain on the Paper unanswered, because it seems to imply a state of things which is not correct. Reserves of food and ammunition for 300 men for three months were kept in Coomassie, and this was considered by the local authorities, who are responsible, to be sufficient. On the first intimation of the rebellion a much larger force than the local authorities then considered necessary was sent to the Gold Coast, but owing to the reluctance of the Gold Coast natives to engage as carriers, and to the extraordinary difficulties created by the heavy rains, the advance of the relieving column has been delayed. I am in constant communication with Colonel Willcocks and the local Government as to the best mode of dealing with the situation thus created and its possible developments. I may add that it is due to the energy of the Governor of Sierra Leone, Sir Frederic Cardew, that we have been able to send to the Gold Coast 3,000 odd carriers from Sierra Leone, and that, generally, we have in every case endeavoured to send to the Gold Coast more, and not less, both of stores and of men than have been requisitioned by the local authorities.

---

† See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiii., p. 398.

‡ See *ibid.*, page 1257.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—RECENT OPERATIONS.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Is there any information that can be given to the House with regard to the state of affairs in China?

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): We have no news from Sir Claude MacDonald later than the 12th instant, but nothing has reached us to confirm the rumour of a general attack on the legations at Peking. The latest telegram from Admiral Seymour's force is dated 13th instant, the telegraph to Tientsin having been cut. A Japanese man-of-war which arrived at Chefoo last night from Ta-ku reported that the commander-in-chief and troops had returned to Tientsin. The Ta-ku forts opened fire on gunboats in the mouth of the river on Sunday at 12.30 a.m.; the ships then engaged the forts, and the engagement was proceeding when the Japanese ship left at 5.30 a.m. Detachments from all the ships of war were landed on Saturday to protect Ta-ku. There was one Chinese ship of war at Ta-ku remaining passive. As regards reinforcements, the British troops from Hong Kong will reach Ta-ku on Thursday. We understand that Russian, French, and Japanese reinforcements are due about the same date. Additional British ships are on their way from Manila and Hong Kong. I need hardly say that no effort is being spared to get in touch with the Admiral, and to give him every support in our power. In the last hour we have heard that telegraphic communication has been re-established with Ta-ku and Tientsin viâ Helampo, north of Manchuria.

MR. YERBURGH: May I ask the First Lord of the Treasury a question of which I have sent him private notice—namely, whether it is the intention of the Government to send native troops from India to reinforce the garrison of Hong Kong?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The answer to my hon. friend's question is in the affirmative.

MOROCCO—SUGGESTED EUROPEAN INTERVENTION.

MR. HAZELL (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the present condition of affairs in Morocco, which it is alleged is such that the leading and intelligent classes of Morocco would welcome some form of European authority that would secure justice to the inhabitants; and whether the time has come when Her Majesty's Government, as representing the country possessing the largest trade interest in Morocco, would consider the advisability of calling a conference of the Powers with a view to the establishment of some concerted European influence over the Moorish Government, in order that the present form of government which prevails, under which open slave markets flourish, may be brought more in conformity with the civilisation of the times.

*MR. BRODRICK: No information has been received which would lead to the belief that European authority would be welcomed in Morocco. The answer to tho second paragraph is in the negative. The orders to the Governors of coast towns to prevent the public sale of slaves were renewed in 1898 at the request of Her Majesty's Minister, who will make representations to the Moorish Government if it should at any time come to his knowledge that these orders are being neglected.

EAST INDIA RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether it has been brought to his notice that the East Indian Railway Company, which is guaranteed by the Indian Government in respect of its interest, has recently placed orders in Germany for wheels and axles instead of in Sheffield, and if the representative of the Government or the Board will be instructed to urge that the shipments shall at least be effected on British ships.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): My honourable friend is aware that the Secretary of State, although he is represented upon the boards of the guaranteed Indian railways, does not control the management or working of the lines. I am informed that for business reasons, as well as on patriotic grounds, a decided preference is given as a rule to goods of English manufacture; but in this case the difference in price, amounting to about £12,350 between Messrs. Krupp's tender and the lowest available English tender, was so great as to make it impossible to adhere to the usual practice. The principles which govern the acceptance of tenders for goods apply equally to tenders for freight. I do not propose to give any special instructions on this occasion, but I have no doubt that British shipping will be employed, unless its employment would involve an unreasonable charge upon the company.

BRITISH TRADE WITH THE SOUDAN.

MR. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the volume and value of British exports and imports to and from the Soudan since the battle of Omdurman.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): Statistics of British exports and imports to and from the Soudan are included in the returns of trade with India, and no separate figures can at present be given. Such information as is available as to the trade of the Soudan since the battle of Omdurman is contained in the report by Lord Cromer, Egypt, No. 1 (1900).

RAILWAY COMPANIES AND PASSENGERS' PERSONAL LUGGAGE.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the intention of the railway companies, in some cases already put into practice, of enforcing charges for passengers' luggage when exceeding a low maximum weight; and whether in view of the inconvenience to the travelling public, especially at holiday times, and of the hardship to people of small means, the Board of Trade will undertake to make suggestions to the railway companies with a view to inducing them to discontinue or largely modify their charges.

The following questions also appeared on the Paper:—

SIR CAMERON GULL (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the joint notice recently issued by the railway companies stating that from 1st May passengers are to be allowed only the following quantity of personal luggage free, namely—first class, 120 lb.; second class, 100 lb.; third class, 60 lb.; and that any excess will be charged for; and whether in view of the fact that under their statutes several companies, either on the whole or on certain parts of their systems, are bound to allow a greater quantity of luggage free, he will take steps to see that these companies do not continue to make these charges, and will require them to display in a prominent place in their stations the amount of free luggage to which each class of passenger is entitled on the various sections of their lines, and the charges which are to be made for any excess.

SIR CAMERON GULL: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that though passengers on the South Eastern and Chatham Railway are entitled to 120 lb. free luggage first class and 100 lb. second class, the company is charging, as regards its through Continental traffic, 6d. each package for registration, and 1s. 1d. for each 10 lb. or part of 10 lb. over 96 lb., while if a bicycle is carried it is not only charged for separately, but is also weighed in with the passenger's luggage and charged for again; and whether, if this is so, he will communicate with the company with the view of putting an end to such charges.

MR RITCHIE: I will answer the questions of the hon. Members for the Barnstaple Division of Devonshire and the Elland Division of Yorkshire at the same time. Although the Board of Trade have no power to regulate the amount of or charges for passengers' luggage they are very sensible of the importance of the question and of the confusion and irritation which will certainly arise as soon as the holiday season commences. The Board will therefore at once communicate with the Railway Association on the subject. The Department will also address a letter to the South Eastern Company upon the special point affecting that company which has been raised by the hon. Baronet.

EDUCATION OF POOR LAW CHILDREN.

MR. TREVELYAN: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state how many boards of guardians send their poor law children to public elementary schools; whether this practice is advocated by the Department; also, how many boards send their children to the public elementary schools, and keep them in the workhouse out of school hours in contact with the adult paupers.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): According to the latest returns 508 boards of guardians send their children to public elementary schools. This practice has for many years past been strongly advocated by the Local Government Board. I am not in a position to give any precise information on the point referred to in the last part of the question, but I may state that in the more populous unions the children are kept in buildings separate from the rest of the paupers, and that in all cases they are required to be treated as a separate class, so that they may be brought as little as possible into contact with the adult paupers.

BOARDING-OUT PAUPER CHILDREN.

MR. TREVELYAN: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can say what number of boards of guardians board out the children chargeable to them within the union, and in how many cases the children are under voluntary committees of management, and in how many cases they depend solely upon inspection by the medical and relieving officers.

MR. CHAPLIN: On the 1st January last 410 boards of guardians boarded out children within the union. In eighty-three unions voluntary committees have been authorised to board out children within the union. Where there is no such committee it devolves upon the medical and relieving officers to make periodical visits and reports with respect to the children.

METROPOLITAN VEHICULAR REGULATIONS.

GENERAL RUSSELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the dangers which occur in crowded thoroughfares from the fact that drivers of covered vans are not obliged to have sidelights; whether he is aware that in nearly all Continental capitals there is a strict regulation on this point, and that it is rigidly enforced; and whether he can see his way to have this precaution made also compulsory in London.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): Covered vans from which drivers are unable to see the traffic on either side of them are undoubtedly a danger; but the police have no power to make any regulation on the subject.

REPORT OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF FACTORIES.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when the portion of the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, which was stated to be ready in May, will be distributed to Members.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: The whole of the Report was completed and sent to the printers a month ago. The date of its issue now depends entirely on the printers, who have been and will be pressed to expedite the work.

ROMAN CATHOLIC OPEN-AIR PROCESSIONS—DISTURBANCE AT PECKHAM.

COLONEL SANDYS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to an open-air procession of Roman Catholics, some of them being ecclesiastics wearing the habits of their orders and exercising the rites and ceremonies of their religion, which took place at Peckham on Sunday, 27th May; whether such procession took place with the permission of the Chief Commissioner of Police; and whether the powers conferred on the Chief Commissioner of Police as to permitting organised processions in the Metropolitan Police are to override the express statutory prohibition contained in 10 Geo. IV. c. 7, s. 26; and whether the proclamation of 15th June, 1852, drawing attention to the illegality of such open-air processions, is still in force.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: The statute referred to does not confer on the Commissioner of Police any power either to consent to or to prohibit such a procession as that mentioned in the question. The duty of the police is simply the ordinary duty of preserving order. The law on the subject is contained in the Act mentioned in the question and not in the proclamation.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Cavan, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the attack made on a religious procession in Peckham on the 27th May; whether he is aware that Lieutenant-Colonel Martin Whale, of the Royal Marines, was one of the leaders of the riotous party which attacked the procession; and whether Whale is on full pay, or on half pay, or in receipt of any salary or pension from the War Office; and, if so, what action the War Office has taken in the matter.

*MR. WYNDHAM: This should be addressed to the Admiralty. The War Office has no jurisdiction over the Royal Marines.

MR. GOSCHEN: I am prepared to answer at once. I have seen a newspaper report which gives a summary of the occurrence in question. It is stated that Colonel Whale, a retired officer of Royal Marines, on meeting the religious procession referred to, had shouted a protest, and in consequence, lost his hat, and that he seemed well satisfied with his day's work. The case does not appear to be one that would justify the withholding of retired pay earned by a service of twenty-four years.

UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC CABLE BETWEEN LONDON AND BIRMINGHAM.

SIR J. LENG: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the underground electric cable between London and Birmingham is working satisfactorily, and whether it will be extended northwards, in order to prevent a recurrence of the prolonged interruption of telegraphic communication between England and Scotland caused by last winter's snowstorms.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The underground telegraph line to Birmingham meets the demand for uninterrupted communication over that part of the country where destructive gales are most prevalent; but it is not at present found to be so generally useful as an overground line, and the Postmaster General cannot at present contemplate its extension to the North.

SUNDAY DUTY IN THE POST OFFICE.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether Sunday duty in the General Post Office, which has hitherto been performed by volunteers, will in future be compulsory on all the staff; whether the work at present done on Sundays is more than can be performed by the number of volunteers at present available; and whether the Post Office authorities are actually removing from Sunday duties those who have volunteered to perform them, and are forcing these duties upon men who conscientiously object to work on Sunday.

MR. HANBURY: Sunday duty will in future be compulsory on all members of the staff of the Circulation Office who entered the service on the condition that they would be liable to such duty. This condition was first imposed in 1898. At present the work on Sundays is more than can be performed by the volunteers available unless some, at any rate, of them attend every Sunday, and regular service seven days a week is not desirable either in the interests of the Department or of the men themselves. Such officers as may desire to avoid attendance on Sundays are at liberty to provide approved substitutes.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): Is there any limit as to this duty?

MR. HANBURY: Does the hon.

Member mean with regard to the number of Sundays or the period of duty?

Mr. CHANNING: Both.

Mr. HANBURY: A man may not do it more often than every other Sunday, and I believe the duty is limited to five hours.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT SCHEDULES.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that copies of rate books at present supplied to clerks of unions do not contain the names of lessees and owners, which are essential for the purpose of making out Labourers Act Schedules; and whether as under this system professional men, auctioneers, and other persons have no means of obtaining information required for their business unless at the county offices, and in view of the inconvenience caused to officials and to the general public by the withdrawal of the valuation lists from the offices of the clerks of unions, he would advise the Local Government Board to restore the practice that existed previous to the Local Government Act, 1898.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central): The new rate books contain only the names of occupiers or of lessees and owners who are liable for rates under Section 52 (1) of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and the Local Government Board do not consider that these books should be burdened with additional information which has no connection with the rate, and is merely required in order to enable schedules for the Labourers Acts to be prepared without reference to the valuation lists in the county council offices, and to facilitate "professional men and auctioneers" in their private business—as suggested in the question.

DUBLIN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ART.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is a want of employment in Dublin, and whether he can state when the new buildings for the College of Science and Art will be commenced in that city.

Mr. G. W. BALFOUR: I am not aware that there is any special want of employment in Dublin at present; and as regards the second part of the question, I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture to a somewhat similar question put to him on the 26th March,* to which reply I have nothing to add.

RENT CASES IN COUNTY CLARE.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received any complaints as to the delays which have occurred in fixing rents in Clare, and whether he will cause inquiry to be made as to the working of the Land Act in that county.

Mr. G. W. BALFOUR: I am not aware that any complaints have been received of the nature mentioned in the question. I am informed that a sub-commission has been continuously at work in disposing of applications to fix fair rents in Clare during the past two years, and that a considerable number of additional cases from the county have been listed for hearing before a sub-commission which will commence its sittings on Friday next. The reply to the second part of the question is in the negative.

THE DISSOLUTION—THE PARLIAMENTARY REGISTER.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is proposed to take steps to accelerate the registration of Parliamentary voters this year, so that, in the event of a Dissolution in the late autumn, the General Election may be taken on a new register.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman has apparently access to information about the Dissolution which is not at my disposal. But whatever date the Dissolution may be fixed for, I do not think that any alteration in the registration of voters ought to be preliminary to it.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxi. p. 331.

WELSH SUNDAY CLOSING BILL.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has received a number of communications from county councils and other public bodies and meetings in Wales appealing to him to give the necessary facilities for passing into law during this session the Welsh Sunday Closing Bill; whether he is aware that this Bill is based upon the unanimous recommendations of the Royal Commission appointed by the Government of which he was a member in 1889; and whether, seeing that this Bill passed its Second Reading without a division on 9th May, and in view of this general consensus of opinion as to its principal provisions, he will endeavour to make such arrangements as will allow the remaining stages of the Bill to be passed this session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is probably as well aware as I am that it is practically impossible to make exceptions in favour of private Members' Bills.

BRITISH MUSEUM—EXTENSION OF BUILDINGS—THE BRITISH MUSEUM BILL.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the trustees of the British Museum are at present prepared with plans for its extension, and whether they have funds bequeathed to them which may be applied to this purpose.

MR. HANBURY: Under the will of the late Mr. Vincent Stuckey Lean the trustees are entitled to a bequest of £50,000 for "the improvement and extension of the library and reading room." A plan for the extension of the museum which would comply with the terms of the bequest at an estimated cost of £150,000 was put forward by the trustees in 1899. Its consideration has been deferred, as the Bill now before Parliament to authorise the trustees to deposit copies of local newspapers with local authorities and to dispose of valueless printed matter would set free a large amount of space.

MR. J. MORLEY (Montrose): Is it not true that the Treasury wrote to the trustees of the museum in August last informing them that they could not feel justified in acceding to any proposal for the extension of the buildings until an attempt had been made to take the opinion of the House, with a view to giving new authority to the trustees for the disposal of newspapers and other printed matter.

MR. HANBURY: I think my answer implied that.

MR. J. MORLEY: That being so I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will give facilities before the end of the session for the discussion, if not the passing, of the Museum Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We consider the Bill to which the right hon. Gentleman refers to be a Bill of a public character, and we are more or less responsible for it in the way stated by my right hon. friend. But whether it would be possible for me to find time this session for the discussion of the Bill is a question which at the present moment I cannot answer.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: May I ask what will be the business for next Thursday and Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My expectation is that the Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill will be taken on Thursday, and the Home Office Vote on Friday.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Is it certain we shall get the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, on which the discussion of the Home Office Vote turns, by Friday night? If we do not, will the right hon. Gentleman undertake not to proceed with that Vote?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will make inquiry. If it is impossible to have the Vote circulated, I will not press the Vote under conditions which would render the discussion of it more or less nugatory.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: We have been told the Report is in the hands of the printers. Perhaps we can have it in a day or two. I will put down a question for to-morrow.

MR. YERBURGH: Do the Government intend to proceed with the Money-lending Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think I have any statement to make upon that subject, but it will, perhaps, be more appropriately raised in the course of the debate which is about to be initiated on my motion.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to the Public Health (Ireland) Bill.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I now rise to move the resolution which stands in my name. I think it will, broadly speaking, fit in with the wishes of the House, and I am certain that it will fit in with its convenience. It is in accordance with precedent that it should be moved by me about this time; in fact, I think it has very frequently been moved before this date. I am aware that the motion will have the effect of depriving certain hon. Members of the opportunity they have obtained of discussing questions which interest them, and, possibly, other people also. That is an inevitable misfortune, but I think it is only due to the Government to say that, as far as I am aware, not a single Tuesday has been taken in the course of this session for advancing the ordinary Government programme of legislation. Tuesdays have been taken for the financial business of the year, but not for the purpose of advancing any single Bill which the Government have upon the Order Paper. In these circumstances, now that we have reached this stage of the session, I think it not unreasonable that the Government should ask the House to give further facilities for proceeding with their general programme. As this is not the time to make a statement with regard to any possible diminution of the size of that programme, I will content myself by moving the resolution of which I have given notice.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That for the remainder of the session Government business do have precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday (except on Wednesdays the 20th and 27th of June), and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 56 be extended to all the days of the week."—(*Mr. A. Balfour.*)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not imagine that there will be much disposition to find fault with a motion of this kind being made at this period of the session, but I am very much surprised to find it unaccompanied by any statement whatever with regard to the prospects of legislation for the rest of the session. If the right hon. Gentleman wishes for a precedent, I would remind him that last year when he made a similar motion he announced what Bills would be proceeded with, and on previous occasions, when such a motion has been made, that explanation has always taken place. I may speak quite frankly. There are certain Bills as to the future fate of which there is considerable doubt in everyone's mind—no doubt as to how the House will regard them, but doubt as to the serious intentions of the Government to proceed with them. I should have thought that this was the very occasion on which the House might expect and, in fact, is entitled to have some information with regard to the fate of those Bills. I do not know when the right hon. Gentleman proposes that there should be a statement made which will enable the House to discuss this part of the Government's proceedings, and I think that most Members will share my astonishment at the course the right hon. Gentleman has taken. As to whether the Government should now take the whole time of the House with certain exceptions, there is, I think, little to be said on that point. I think the right hon. Gentleman stretched his demand upon the assent of the House a little too far when he said the Government had not previously in the session taken Tuesdays for legislative business. He admitted that they had taken them for financial purposes, and I would point out that in so doing they freed other Government days for legislative work, and the effect upon the rights of private Members was exactly the same as if the Tuesdays had been used to advance Government Bills. Now, I have an appeal to make to the right hon. Gentleman. He proposes to give us two Wednesdays for the further discussion of certain more fortunate Private Members' Bills. In the past, three Wednesdays have usually been set apart for that purpose, and I do not know why he is so niggardly with his allowance on the present occasion. I think, after looking into the matter, that it requires a little more consideration than seems to have been given to it. We have now an experience extending over a year or two of this proposal, and I can only say that it has worked in a haphazard way. I do not know what is the rule as to the seniority of a Bill. A Bill may be read a second time unanimously, and it may have entered on the Committee stage, but another Bill, referred to a Standing Committee, may take precedence of it. That is an irregular form of arrangement which I think hardly carries out the intention of the rules of the House. There is a Bill for prohibiting the sale of drink to children under sixteen years of age. This is a Bill which has created an immense amount of feeling throughout the country. I am —as no doubt is the right hon. Gentleman—in receipt of communications from all quarters with regard to this Bill. The representations have come to me not from those interested in party questions, not from fanatics, not from those having strong opinions on the licensing question, but from churches, Sunday schools, and other recognised institutions in their thousands, showing that there is an immense amount of feeling on both sides quite apart from party division. One memorial signed by some thousands of Sunday-school teachers and managers has come from Liverpool. The Bill received the unanimous assent of the House. [" No, no ! "] Well, there was no division on it. But now it is in the third place, not in the first, because it was not referred, at the request of the Home Secretary, to the Standing Committee. I believe that if my hon. friend had resisted the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman the feeling of the House was such that his motion would have been carried and the Bill would have retained its precedence. Other Bills I could mention have met a similar unfortunate fate. I object to this happy-go-lucky system and its effect on the Bills before the House. The feeling in the country is very strong on this question, and I make an appeal to the Government to give some special opportunity for the further progress of this Bill. My object in rising was to point out that the rule works unequally, unfairly, and deserves the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, who has done so much, while Leader of the House, to increase the efficiency of our manner of conducting business.

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I will not follow the right hon. Gentleman in the *ex parte* statement he has made on behalf of a Bill set down for consideration on a future day. But I must enter my protest against the statement that the Bill was unanimously accepted by the House. What occurred was that it came on unexpectedly in the absence of most of the opponents of the Bill, and so far from being unopposed the right hon. Gentleman must be well aware that it will be strongly resisted in its future stages in this House, and I must say that it would have been more candid if he had recognised these facts in his references to the subject. But without following the right hon. Gentleman into the somewhat irregular channel into which he has attempted to draw the House I should like to put before my right hon. friend reasons why he certainly should not give more Wednesdays up for the purpose suggested by the right hon. Gentleman If he requires time he should take it impartially from Members who are interested in motions and from those who are interested in Bills. In regard to the present motion we are asked to give up for the rest of the session any power we possess of raising any question, be it important, urgent, or otherwise, in this House. I shall be told perhaps that Standing Order No. 17 makes provision for raising questions of urgency. My reply is that, for reasons with which the House is familiar, that has ceased to be the safeguard which it was intended by its promoters to be. I will not, however, go into this question in detail. I notice that my right hon. friend approaches this subject of Motions for Adjournment on matters of urgency in a somewhat changeful mood; in fact, his attitude is somewhat suggestive of that which dominated Pharaoh during the intervals between the Egyptian plagues. At times he is very sympathetic, but at other periods, when the immediate peril has subsided, he relapses into hardness of heart. I could go on to remind my right hon. friend of other examples, but perhaps I had better not do so, lest I give rise to misapprehension. I would refer however, to an allegorical personage—

and I do not suggest for one moment that my right hon. friend reminds me of that personage in either shape or form, for on the contrary I regard him as the embodiment of his absolute antithesis — hence I may allude to the allegorical personage who, when sick, was alleged to have formed resolves in the direction of becoming a monk, or, as some versions have it, a saint, but whose aspirations towards canonisation, and yearnings for the cloister, evaporated on convalescence. At any rate, the right hon. Gentleman will admit that, by the interpretation which has been put upon our procedure, we may be precluded by a Member absent in South Africa, or even by a Member here, from raising any of those important questions which it was intended we should be enabled to raise under the Standing Order I have referred to. I do not wish, however, to offer any objection to the taking of private Members' time for the *bonâ fide* purpose of winding up the session, which, I take it, is the real object of the right hon. Gentleman's motion, but I do wish to point out that he is placing us in an unprecedented position with regard to our powers of raising questions of urgency, and I certainly hope he will give this matter consideration at the earliest opportunity.

Sir CHARLES DILKE: We are called upon to-day to sacrifice a large number of Private Members' Bills to which there is practically no opposition at all, and we are called upon to do this without knowing what is to be the probable fate of at least four Government Bills that are likely to take a great deal of time, and which will in all probability be dropped. We are, therefore, asked to decide this question in the dark. We cannot possibly say whether two or three Wednesdays will or will not be required for Private Members' Bills until we compare the Government Bills which are likely to be dropped, and the Private Members' Bills which will be killed if this motion is carried. This matter is one of some importance on account of its bearing on the procedure of the Standing Committees of this House. The Standing Committees this year have been very hard-worked indeed; they have had, and still have a larger number of Bills under their consideration than has ever been the case before. A considerable number of those Bills are measures to which there is either little or no opposition at all, so far as one can judge by the Second Reading debates and the discussions before the Standing Committees themselves. The Government Bills to which I have especially referred are four in number. I do not speak of Scotch or Irish Bills with which I am not acquainted, but speaking of English Bills there are four which, from what we have heard and seen for ourselves, seem likely to be dropped. It is probable the Companies Bill will be dropped. If the Government had intended to persevere with that useful measure, in which so great a number of Members are interested, I imagine they would have made some progress with it before this time. The fact that it has been put in a fair position among the Orders of the Day on almost every Monday, but never in a very high position, leads those of us who have some experience of these matters to think it is not intended by the Government to pass that Bill this session. There is also the Factory and Workshops Bill, which has occupied a position just below the Companies Bill all through the session, and with which also there has been no serious attempt to go forward. Then there is the Money-lending Bill, which was the subject of inquiry recently, and there is another Bill, also of importance, and one which is rather actively opposed—namely, the Dogs Regulation Bill. I imagine there are few Members under the impression that the Government will pass these Bills through the House, and yet the fact that they will not tell us what they mean to do in regard to any of them keeps us in the dark in this debate. On the other hand, the Private Members' Bills of this year are very numerous and important—I mean not the ordinary Private Members' Bills which are brought in every year, but Bills which have either passed through or are still before the Standing Committee or have been read a second time unanimously or by overwhelming majorities. I may add one other Bill, in which, throughout the Empire, great interest is taken, and which stands in a position somewhat similar to those I have mentioned—a Bill which is passing not through this House, but through the House of Lords: I mean the Colonial Marriages Bill. This is a measure which has in its favour an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Parliament, but to which, if this motion is carried, we shall not be able to afford any time. But, putting aside the Colonial Marriages Bill, there are a singularly large number of Bills this year which, although in the hands of private Members, have passed through, or are before a Standing Committee. If this motion is carried, in what an extraordinary position the two Standing Committees will remain during the rest of the session! They will have Bills coming before them on four days a week, and Members will be asked to attend at great inconvenience, to make great sacrifices, to give up all other engagements, and to sit in this House for twelve hours a day with the certainty that their work will be entirely useless, knowing that those Bills with which they are called upon to deal, if a single Member opposes them, will have no chance whatever of passing into law. There is the Workmen's Compensation Bill which has passed through Standing Committee, and it stands first for next Wednesday. There can be no doubt that that Bill will pass. It passed its Second Reading unanimously, and it passed through Standing Committee after a great deal of discussion, but without any opposition. Though very short, it is an extremely complicated and difficult Bill, which undoubtedly deserves and will receive careful consideration at the hands of the House. There is every probability that on Report next Wednesday, and on Third Reading the Wednesday after, the measure will occupy the whole of the sitting. That, therefore, is the one Bill to which this proposal gives a chance, all other Bills, as it appears to me, having no chance whatever if this motion is carried. Among the other Bills there is the Merchant Shipping Bill, in the hands of hon. Members opposite, which has passed its Second Reading and the Standing Committee, and in which a great number of shipping Members are interested. There is the Borough Funds Bill, a Bill of the utmost importance, in regard to which there is a general agreement, and which, on pledges being given that certain modifications should be made in Committee, passed its Second Reading without opposition. Those modifications were made, and the Bill passed very rapidly through Standing Committee, but still, if a single Member of this House opposes that Bill after this motion is carried, it will be lost. I say a single Member of this House, because it is unfortunately the fact—and a fact which I think is a scandal in relation to the performances of this House—that during the last four or five years, if two Members have actively opposed any Private Member's Bill, that Bill has not been carried. I believe that during the last two or three years no Private Member's Bill has been carried which was actively opposed at all its stages by even a single Member. The Bill of last year as to children under thirteen years of age, although very actively opposed on the Second Reading and Committee stages, was not really opposed on Report or Third Reading. In addition to the Bills to which I have referred, there is a Scotch Bill coming before the Standing Committee—namely, the Town Councils (Scotland) Bill, a very important Bill, and one which will, no doubt, pass through the Standing Committee, but with the certainty that if one Member actively opposes the Bill all the labours of the Standing Committee with regard to it will be lost. Then there is the County and Borough Franchise (London) Bill, a Bill to which a great number of Members attach very high importance. That Bill is down to come before the Standing Committee. There is a general agreement as to what it should contain, but it is a Bill of a kind which is almost certain after it has passed through the Standing Committee to meet with opposition from one or two Members of this House if it is known that such opposition is sufficient to kill the Bill. That is a case of a Bill which, although supported by an overwhelming majority of the Members of this House, will undoubtedly be killed if this motion is carried. Then there is the Sunday Closing (Wales) Bill, which also has still to go before the Standing Committee, and which also no doubt will be killed by this proposal. I venture to suggest that there never has been an occasion when the issue presented to the House by this seemingly unimportant motion was more important on its bearing on the forms of the House than on this occasion. There has never been an occasion when the practical difference in modern times between what was meant by the resolution as to business after Whitsuntide and the actual fact was more startling than it is to-day. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the manner in which Bills are grouped after Whitsuntide. That proposal was one carried by Sir Stafford Northcote's Committee, by which, on Wednesdays after Whitsuntide, Bills were placed in order according to the amount of progress they had made. When that proposal was carried the idea was that it should apply to the remaining Wednesdays of the session until we reached August, and that was the practice of the House. But when the operation of the Standing Order is narrowed to two Wednesdays only it becomes ridiculous, and as every Member of the House knows, it stands now in a ludicrous position. We should not be in order on this or any similar occasion when we are discussing a motion to take time—although our minds cannot be free from the consideration of the matter—in dealing with proposals to change the forms of the House. I am one of those who think the House, or large bodies of Members of the House, should have the power of deciding on the order in which Bills should be presented to the House. We should not, however, be in order in discussing that or any such proposal on this occasion, but the scandal of the present system—the certainty that all these Bills, upon which so much labour has been bestowed, which have occupied and still will occupy the attention of the Standing Committees (if under these circumstances quorums can be obtained to consider the Bills) will be sacrificed by this resolution for a Government programme which is not announced to us—seems to me to be greater on this occasion than ever at any time before.

MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): I think many Members share the feeling of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, as to the novelty of the position taken up by my right hon. friend the Leader of the House on this occasion. On all former occasions, as far as I can remember, when it was proposed to absorb additional time after Whitsuntide, it has been recognised that something was being taken from private Members, and the Leader of the House has given assurances that the time so taken should be spent on certain definite objects. It was a kind of "give and take" arrangement, from which I think my right hon. friend has on this occasion for the first time departed. It is a rather remarkable and, I think, unfortunate circumstance. It is especially unfortunate in view of the fact, put before us by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, that a large part of the Government programme will probably not be persevered with. There is no serious suggestion that some of the Bills will be carried into law, while, on the other hand, there are a great number of Private Members' Bills, in some of which the Government themselves have a kind of interest, which will be entirely destroyed or shorn of all chance of success by the proposal now before us. For example, there is the Bill which was made the subject of question and answer to-day—a Bill which was brought in under the charge of private Members but which, as the right hon. Gentleman has said, was instigated by the Government themselves. That Bill may or may not command the assent of the House, but it is a measure which ought to be allowed to come under consideration. My object in rising to-day, however, is not merely to repeat what has been said so admirably by the right hon. Gentleman, but to point out that there is really no reason this year for the restriction of the exceptional Wednesdays to the first two after Whitsuntide. When the rule was first adopted giving after Whitsuntide precedence to Bills in the order of the amount of progress they had made, the right of private Members to Wednesdays was not interfered with until the end of July. We used to have all the Wednesdays after Whitsuntide to the end of July, and the Orders were absorbed for Government business. That is quite defensible when there is a large amount of public business in which we are all interested impeded in its progress. But that does not apply this year, and we are not justified in adopting the new plan of restricting the Wednesdays allowed to private Members to the two mentioned in the resolution, when the motive for the restriction is not present. Besides the Bills which have been proceeded with in this House, there is one which has commanded a majority in another place, and which would be sure to pass this House, as we have not even a Bench of Bishops to give a majority in opposition to it—I mean the Bill with respect to colonial marriages. That Bill will be shut out altogether in the event of this resolution being adopted. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to the fact that it will be within the power of any one Member to prevent further progress being made with any of these Bills. But as soon as the Government absorb every evening and every afternoon, pressure is naturally and rightly put on the Government to adopt the further rule of moving the adjournment of the House as soon as Government business is disposed of. On these grounds I think there is a very strong case for reconsidering the proposition made by my right hon. friend. I think the House would be well advised in excluding altogether Wednesday from the purview of the resolution before the House. I do press very strongly upon the right hon. Gentleman that Wednesday should be excluded altogether from this motion.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I think the House has some ground to complain that the right hon. Gentleman has not given any reason except a purely formal one for the motion which he asks the House to accept. He has asked permission to take Wednesday up to the end of the session without telling the House what he proposes to do with the Wednesdays which will be absorbed. Hitherto a proposition of this kind has never been made only upon the ground that there was a mass of Government business to be got through, but on this occasion the right hon. Gentleman has not followed even his own precedent. On the 19th of June last year* the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House made a similar proposal, and moved a resolution in the same words, and in his speech in support of the motion he said—

> "I do not propose to give an exact programme of what we hope to pass, because that would be impossible; nor has anyone in my position, at this period of the session, ever attempted such a task."

Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to read a list of the various measures before the House, the various stages they had reached, and what he thought would happen to them. What is still more important, the right hon. Gentleman gave the House a pledge with reference to the introduction of any future measures to the effect that no Bills of a controversial character would be introduced. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I do not, of course, say that all these measures will, as a matter of fact, pass into law before we separate, but I hope very substantial progress will be made with the list which I have just read to the House."

What the right hon. Gentleman did then was to give the House an idea of what was passing in the mind of the Government, so that the House was put in possession of what the Government proposed to do in regard to the business for the rest of the session. I agree with what has been said by my right hon. friend as to the very important Private Members' Bills which have not yet been disposed of, and about which there can be very little doubt that they will not be disposed of this session. But at any rate we have a right to know what the Government intend to do with their own Bills, what they intend to proceed with, and what they do not intend to proceed with. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean has alluded to two Bills which the right hon. Gentleman referred to in his speech last year. For example, there is the Money-lending Bill. I think the House has a right to know whether the Government are in earnest about that Bill or not. There is another Bill which has not been mentioned, with reference to which I must say that if it is not proceeded with it will amount almost to a public scandal —I refer to the Companies Bill. That is a serious scandal in commercial life which ought to be dealt with at once. It is not in an incomplete state. That measure has been under the consideration of the House of Lords and the Judges and others for three or four years, and they have sent the Bill down to this House. I do not mean to say that the measure is perfect, but upon many points connected with it there is a general assent among the commercial and legal public. If the Government would put their foot down they can carry that Bill through the House during the remainder of this session. [Mr. GIBSON BOWLES dissented.] My hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn shakes his head, but I think even his opposition might be overcome by a strong Government. Then there is the Factories Bill, and there is also another measure which I think ought not to be put on one side this session under the peculiar circumstances of the case—I mean the Colonial Marriages Bill. That is a Bill which the Imperial Parliament ought to deal with. It has been passed by an enormous majority this session on the Second Reading in the House of

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxii, page 1502.

Lords, and it is a Bill upon which there can be no shadow of a doubt that there is an enormous majority in this House in favour of it. I think also that the time has arrived when the right hon. Gentleman should make a stand with regard to the enormous power which insignificant majorities in this House have of preventing legislation which the majority of this House desire to pass. I think the time has arrived for a thorough reconsideration of a great many of the rules of the House, for many of them are not adapted to meet our needs. An enormous amount of the time of the House of Commons is deliberately wasted session after session, and especially the references to Grand Committees requires reconsideration. I consider the mode of reference to Grand Committees is a departure from the principles which Mr. Gladstone laid down when he made the motion for these Grand Committees, because the House has now thrown upon them a larger amount of business which it has become impossible for them to pass through during the remainder of the session after Whitsuntide. I think all these questions —and especially the 17th Standing Order to which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet has alluded— require to be dealt with, for this Standing Order places it within the power of one hon. Member to prevent the House of Commons from discussing most important questions affecting the Empire. I think all these things ought to be sufficient to convince the right hon. Gentleman that the time has arrived to reconsider some of our rules of debate. Upon the present occasion the right hon. Gentleman has not told us for what purpose he is asking the House of Commons to adopt this course. I think the House ought to know to what purpose he intends devoting the time which he is asking the House of Commons to concede.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As several hon. Members of great importance in this House, occupying leading positions with regard to public business, have risen in their places and attacked me on the present occasion, I think I ought not to defer my reply to the strictures they have passed. The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has laid special emphasis upon one of those criticisms. The right hon. Gentleman has repeated with more elaboration the charge made by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government have failed on this occasion to explain the need for further facilities for the conduct of Government business. The right hon. Gentleman is under a misapprehension. I have in this respect carefully followed precedent. The right hon. Gentleman quoted, to my great surprise, a speech of mine made last year on the 19th of June, at a similar period of the session, when I asked for similar powers. If the right hon. Gentleman had read that speech carefully he would see that I deliberately declined, either in that speech or in the course of the debate which followed, to in any sense indicate what Bills the Government were determined to pass or what Bills they felt bound to sacrifice. There was a period of the session which was well known to hon. Members—the Parliamentary "massacre of innocents" —on which that statement was made to the House; but on the present occasion it was never made, and I certainly did not make the statement when I asked last year for the privilege I now ask the House to give. It would be impossible at this period of the session to make such a statement; it would be in the highest degree inexpedient for the Government to attempt to foretell the various measures which should be proceeded with, a power which even the most experienced Members certainly could not lay claim to. How is it possible to foretell the length of time the various motions on the Order Paper will take? It is not possible, and until the Government have some further information on that point, in my judgment it will be in the highest degree inexpedient to give the right hon. Gentleman the information he desires. I pass from the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton to the criticisms made by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and my right hon. friend the Member for Bodmin, who preceded him. As I understand them, they say that the number of Private Members' Bills is so great, and they are of such great importance, that the Government ought to sacrifice their own time and allow these Wednesdays to remain in the possession of private Members. I entirely dissent from that view. I think that it would be a departure from precedent, and it would not conduce to the general convenience of the House. I also must enter, not for the first time, my protest against the view that Private Members' Bills stand on an equality of treatment with Government Bills. They do not stand on the same equality of treatment. Time after time the hon. Member for East Mayo has protested against Government Bills being brought in under what is known as the Ten Minutes Rule. A private Member may bring in a Bill abolishing the House of Lords, or the Monarchy, not under the Ten Minutes rule, but without a word being said. No Government has ever attempted to bring in a Bill making a really important constitutional change without observing the full forms of the House, involving a consequent expenditure of time. It has now become practically a fixed rule and tradition of this House, although it is not embodied in the Standing Orders, that whatever a Private Member's Bill may be it may be brought in at twelve o'clock on Wednesday, and then that four and a half hours of discussion is enough to decide the principle of that measure. I am not aware that either you, Sir, or your predecessor in the Chair has ever refused the closure for a Bill brought in under these conditions. What Government Bill of any importance has ever been allowed to pass this House after a discussion of four and a half hours? Such a state of things would not be tolerated. We should be told that it was a gross invasion of Parliamentary privileges if the Government asked for, and Mr. Speaker granted, the closure on any first-class measure, or even on any second-class measure of importance after four and a half hours discussion. Why has this House tolerated these peculiar privileges to Private Members' Bills on their earlier stages? Is it because the House attaches greater value to the legislative efforts of private Members than to the legislative efforts of the Government? It has never committed itself to any doctrine so absurd as that. The real truth is, although it is not embodied in the forms of the House, that the great majority of our Wednesday afternoon Bills are not discussed at all in a manner comparable with the discussion on Government measures. The discussions are more in the nature of decisions of the House on certain abstract propositions conceived to be embodied in the Bills before them. Every hon. Member knows that what I say is correct. An hon. Member will get up and say, "This is an absurd Bill; it contains this or that impossible provision, but yet it embodies some principles I approve of, and therefore I will either abstain or will vote for the Second Reading." That is not the way Government Bills are treated or ought to be treated. If we are going to give all these privileges to private Members' Bills in their earlier stages, and then in addition extend to them all the privileges of Government Bills in their later stages, I think our legislative system will fall into chaos, and the legislative business of this House will not show itself to the best advantage. As regards the particular measures which have been mentioned I have another answer. The right hon. Gentleman opposite said: "Here is the Companies Bill, which is a most important Bill; a Bill to cut out the gangrene which is eating into our commercial system, and it will be a public scandal if it does not pass this year." But what chance has it of passing unless we get the time?

SIR HENRY FOWLER: Will you pass it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, yes; we want to pass all our Bills. For the right hon. Gentleman to say in one breath that this motion ought to be opposed because it takes away the time of private Members, and then to blame the Government for not passing Bills, seems to me a position so inconsistent that I hardly believe the right hon. Gentleman appreciates the argument he is using. Allusion has been made to my speech last year on a similar occasion. It is quite true that that speech was longer than the speech with which I introduced the motion on this occasion, but we had to deal with several important controversial Bills, and the House was anxious to know what future legislation the Government contemplated. If the House desires the assurance, I can assure them that no controversial business, so far as I am aware, other than that already before the House or that has been introduced in another place—there are two Army Bills, I think, in another place—will be taken I quite agree that it would be most unfair to ask the House to give us this time and then start a large number or even a single controversial Bill of which no notice had been given. We do not propose to take any such course. Hon. Gentlemen will find in the Order Paper which was issued this morning a full account of all the controversial business, or business which may be described as controversial or important, which the Government will attempt to pass. I am told that the Agricultural Holdings Bill and the Sea Fisheries Bill are not on the Paper, but they are included in that statement. I quite recognise that hon. Gentlemen have a right to the pledge I have just given. I do not, of course, promise that no Departmental Bills will be introduced, but even a Departmental Bill, if seriously opposed or opposed at all, will not be pressed on the notice of the House. I hope, under these circumstances and after the explanation I have given, the House will assent to the motion without a division.

MR. KEARLEY: The speeches which have been delivered so far on this motion deal with the question of Bills, but there is a great deal in what has been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Isle of Thanet, that some amount of consideration should be given to motions. I am interested in a motion which I, at all events, and many people in the country feel to be one of urgency. I was very much surprised at the reply which was given to my modest request for an opportunity to discuss this motion. We might well expect that we should be given an opportunity of discussing first of all the Report of Lord Justice Collins's Committee on the administration of war funds; and, secondly, the proposals which the right hon. Gentleman tells us the Government have under consideration with reference to this question. I should be out of order in going into details, but I should like to press one important fact on the attention of the House. That is, that the flow of public benevolence in the way of providing pensions has practically come to an end, and there is no further expectation of any larger contributions being made by the public. That is perfectly obvious to anyone who has followed the amounts contributed day by day. On the other hand, the number of widows, as a result of the war, amounts to 2,000, and I am told they will continue to increase at the rate of 250 or 300 per month. I merely mention that to impress on the right hon. Gentleman that this question is urgent, and to press him again to give us an opportunity of discussing the Report of the Committee, and also the proposals of the Government with reference to it. The time is ripe for that discussion. This is no matter of an abstract resolution, but a matter in which the country is deeply interested. I intend to make my protest unless I get some satisfactory assurance. Meantime I will move the Amendment which I have handed in, which is to exclude to-morrow, which is the day on which the motion would come on.

MR. CHANNING: On a point of order, I wish to ask whether the Amendment of my hon. friend has priority over my Amendment, which is to leave out all words after Tuesday, so as to restrict the effect on the motion to Tuesdays.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must move to substitute "Tuesdays" for "Tuesday," and to leave out to the end of the line. That Amendment takes precedence of the other Amendment.

MR. CHANNING: In moving my Amendment, which seems to me to be the logical outcome of the unanswered and unanswerable speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bodmin, I should like to make one remark as to the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury, which seemed to be as unsatisfactory as it was singular. The right hon. Gentleman deprecated abstract discussions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never did anything of the kind.

MR. CHANNING: I do not mean that the right hon. Gentleman in terms deprecated abstract discussions, but what he did deprecate was the giving a further time to private Members on the ground that Wednesdays were usually occupied with abstract discussions. But I would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that Private Members' Bills which have obtained the assent of the House with unanimity or without division, and which represent the opinion of the majority of the House, and presumably of the country, cannot be regarded as matters of abstract discussion, but as the practical decisions of the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman wishes to withhold time from these Bills, and not to give further facilities for them, although it has been proved by the decisions of the House itself that they are not mere abstract questions, but questions of practical urgency. The right hon. Gentleman fell foul of my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton for challenging his policy in not making any statement whatever as to the use of the time which the Government propose to take. I suppose the right hon. Gentleman has already forgotten that the Companies Bill held the first place in the Queen's Speech in the present session, and that it has already passed the House of Lords. It is singular and unprecedented that at this period of the session such a Bill should be left in the lurch, and that the right hon. Gentleman is not ready to make any statement regarding a measure of such urgency and importance to the commercial interests of the country. The right hon. Gentleman is in this dilemma—that he has given no case for the Government proposals, and he refuses time for the proposals of private Members —an unprecedented number of which have unanimously passed their Second Reading, have been sent to Standing Committees, and have received the laborious consideration of many Members of this House. I venture to say that in a session like this—there might be some sessions in which he would undoubtedly be justified in making his present proposals—but in a session like this when the enormous number of measures referred to by the right hon. the Member for Forest of Dean are waiting for the final decision of the House, it would be a monstrous scandal if the House of Commons did not allow further time for carrying to completion Bills which have received general assent.

MR. SOUTTAR (Dumfriesshire): I beg to second the Amendment, and to make an appeal to the Leader of the House, who perhaps knows that I had the opportunity of bringing in a Bill on the 9th March which passed its Second Reading. It has been said by the right hon. Gentleman below the gangway that that was an accident; but I do not understand the meaning of the word "accident" as applied to a Bill in that way.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: It came on at an unexpected hour.

MR. SOUTTAR: I can only say that it was on the Order Paper of this House eight times before it came on, and that if it came on unexpectedly it did so in a very crowded House, and all the benches were full and hon. Members were standing below the Bar. But I do not desire to base my appeal on that ground at all. I believe that the heart of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House is in the right place with regard to this measure, and I should be most grateful, and I am sure many others on his own side of the House would be likewise grateful, if he could give our case some little kindly consideration. I know perfectly well that the gift of another Wednesday would be valueless unless he gave the case his personal consideration; but I am certain that one word from him would be golden, and this measure might then easily pass into law. I may say one thing in regard to the Bill which may not have reached the right hon. Gentleman's notice. The fact that I am connected with this particular measure is an accident. Five Bills drafted in almost exactly the same phraseology and having precisely the same effect were introduced this session—three of which were promoted from the right hon. Gentleman's own side of the House—one by the hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Glasgow, one by the hon. Member for Norwood, and the third, begun in another place, was initiated by one of the Belfast Members. It will be seen that there is a wonderful unanimity of feeling in regard to this particular measure, for each one of these five Bills had five separate sets of backers, and in two cases these backers were almost entirely members of the Conservative party. I do trust the right hon. Gentleman will be kindly in this matter and do something to help forward a measure in connection with which much good will be done in the country. If he will only help it he will gain great popularity in the country and strengthen the position of his own supporters.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'Tuesday,' and insert the word 'Tuesdays," instead thereof."—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Tuesday' stand part of the Question."

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: The hon. Members the mover and the seconder of the Amendment have with great ability shown the strongest part of the Government case. If there is a day that can be spared to the Government it is Wednesday—far before Tuesday. The hon. Member for Dumfriesshire has given a very apposite illustration of the mischief that can be done on Wednesdays. He says that the Second Reading of the Bill in which he is interested was not an accident, and then he proceeded to prove that it was an accident by saying that it had been eight times on the Order Paper before. Surely if it came on on the ninth time that may be considered accidental. The hon. Member for East Northamptonshire says that these Bills represent the unanimous vote of the House, or that the vast majority of the House pass them. It is perfectly well known that never on Wednesdays is there a vast majority of the House present, but only a small minority who occupy the afternoon in bringing forward motions or Bills which cannot come on on any other day. I maintain that the vast majority of the Bills read a second time on Wednesdays are so read because the House knows perfectly well that they will never be heard of again. I have not the legislative appetite of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bodmin, who seems to think that we should spend all our time in passing Acts of Parliament. Most, or at least many, of these Acts do a great deal more harm than good. As to the Grand Committees which he held up to our approbation—the attempt to delegate the business of this House to a portion of its Members has been a complete failure. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment dwelt upon the fact that the First Lord of the Treasury in his first speech did not specify the Bills which the Government intended to go on with; but the right hon. Gentleman has remedied that in his second speech, for he has now told us that what is on the Blue Paper is what the Government seriously propose to go on with, and that they will deal with nothing else that is contentious. [Mr. Balfour dissented.] I understood the First Lord to say that there were certain Bills on the Blue Paper which were uncontentious, but if there were any contentious Bills they would not be pressed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope I have not been so obscure in my statement. What I said was that the Blue Paper contained the full Government programme with the exception of one or two Bills which were before the Committees, and one or two Military Bills which are in the House of Lords, and that outside that no new measures of a contentious character would be proceeded with.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: What escaped me was the proviso in regard to Bills before Committees. The Bill I was thinking of, the Undersized Fish Bill, is before a Committee, and that is a very contentious measure and will be very strongly opposed when it again comes before the House. Undoubtedly at this time of the year the Government have a very considerable case for taking—I won't say the Tuesdays, but the Wednesdays. I therefore shall be able with a most unseared conscience to vote against the Amendment now made. Of all the days of the week the most mischievous is Wednesday, and the least useful. I think when I come to the Tuesdays which this Amendment proposes to give to the Government——

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is out of order in referring to Tuesday under this Amendment.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Then, when the debate on the main question is resumed I am afraid I shall have to trouble you with further remarks. All I say in regard to Wednesdays is, that I shall hail with pleasure their disappearance from the private Members' programme. I am a member of a very useful Committee—the Public Accounts Committee—which meets on Wednesday, and my attention will not be diverted from the important work on that Committee in order to come downstairs to vote against private Members' Bills on that day. Before I sit down I wish to dissociate myself from the remark made by the right hon. Member for the Isle of Thanet when he throws doubt on the existence of a personage I was always taught to believe in. If that historical personage and his dwelling place are to be regarded as wholly allegorical, then he has deprived many pious friends of their greatest hopes—for other people.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I cannot refrain from uttering my protest against a resolution the effect of which is to cut off any chance of a Bill in which I am interested becoming law—the Bill, namely, to amend the Welsh Sunday Closing Act of 1881. That Bill passed without a division its Second Reading on 9th May. It is not an abstract question; nor is it a useless Bill. It is a Bill which is founded upon the deliberate judgment of two Commissions, and which. I venture to say has a body of support in Wales which few measures introduced in this House have had in previous years. I do not intend to take up the time of the House on the present occasion in elaborating my protest, but it is impossible for me, knowing as I do, the great interest that the people of Wales take in this Bill; knowing how easily it might be passed, seeing it is a simple, short, and noncontentious Bill—to refrain from expressing my great regret that the Leader of the House, in answering my question, should have said that there is very little chance of giving any favourable consideration to the Bill during the present session. I admit that the root of the difficulty we are in in regard to these Bills is not the present motion, but the rules of the House; and I hope the day is not far distant when some arrangement will be made which will enable a Bill of this kind, with so much support, to be passed into law, and thus carry out the predominant sentiment of the people of Wales.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman has put a considerable strain upon the loyalty of those who are his supporters, including myself. In my earlier remarks I began by saying that this was not an unreasonable motion to be made at this time of the year; but I did expect that the right hon. Gentleman would give us some reason for the support which he wants us to give him. We wish to know what he means to do with the time when he gets it; and I think he has departed from the usual practice on this matter. But now it is proposed that Wednesdays should be left and that Tuesdays should be taken. This is a sort of discussion in which every man is most anxious to sacrifice his neighbour. If I am interested in a Tuesday, then I say that the Wednesday should go; if I am interested in the Wednesday, then it is the other way. I think we should be impartial in regard to this matter. Notwithstanding the unfortunate effect of our present rules upon certain Bills—one of which I dwelt upon as being a very good case—I do not think that on that ground we are entitled to jump to the opposite extreme, and leave the whole of the Wednesdays alive for the private Members to the end of the session. It may be a very right thing, possibly, that the Wednesdays should belong to private Members from one end of the session to the other; but let it be done in a deliberate way, and regard paid to the rules of the House in a wider spirit, not simply because there happens to be a great number of useful private Members' Bills at the present moment on the stocks. The development of private Members' Bills, no doubt, has been great. I do not know that it was originally intended, when Standing Committees were set up, that private Members' Bills were to be sent up to them at all; but they do go to them, and the consequence is that we have great labour expended on these Bills at this choking time of the session, and then they are deprived of all sort of useful life. I deplore that, but at the same time I think it is the fault of our rules, which ought to be remodelled with a view to prevent the recurrence of such circumstances. I hardly see my way to support the Amendment, which would take the whole of the Wednesdays from the Government for the rest of the session and give them to private Members.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I quite sympathise with what has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman. I think we should all of us wish to give the Government the Wednesdays at a somewhat more reasonable period than is proposed by the present motion. I am perfectly ready to leave it to the House to modify the Amendment, so that only a certain number of Wednesdays should be excepted, leaving it to the Government to propose later on to take the whole time of the House. Before I sit down I wish to add my strong protest against the blocking of the Welsh Sunday Closing Bill, in regard to which there is a very strong feeling in Wales. But there is another Bill of even greater importance—the Bill, namely, to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors to children under sixteen years of age. Only this morning I received from a board of guardians of which I am a member, and which stands very high indeed amongst the well-administered boards, a resolution to the following effect—

> "The guardians of this board being of opinion that a large proportion of the pauperism and crime of this country is due to the excessive consumption of intoxicating drink——"

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is going beyond the limits of comment on the motion before the House.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: I submitted myself to the House before I began to read. I have simply to say that I have a very strongly worded resolution from a board of guardians——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is out of order.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: By way of apology, I wish to say that I am only desirous of emphasising the importance of the Bill which the Government are now intending to burke.

MR. COURTNEY: I understand that the Amendment is to except the Wednesdays from the present resolution. But I would point out that the present resolution, however amended, is one that can be amended again. Even if the Amendment were carried the Government can return at the end of the month, say that they want to get more time, and then take the Wednesdays. It seems to me that the Amendment would not accomplish what the hon. Gentleman desires.

MR. TRITTON (Lambeth, Norwood): I intend to vote for the Amendment, because I want some more time to be accorded in this House to the consideration of what I believe is one of the most important Bills before the House this session. The Bill I refer to has been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, and he told us the sad and somewhat hard fate that had befallen it. It was the first Bill carried through to a Second Reading, and that without any opposition, and it was put down for the first Wednesday after Whitsuntide in the sure and certain hope, as far as anything can be made sure and certain in this House, that it would have the first place after the Whitsuntide recess. Hon. Members will see that there are now two other Bills of very considerable importance placed before it. The Bill to stop the sale of intoxicating liquors to children is the outcome of the Joint Reports of the Royal Commission, and it has received unanimous support throughout the country. I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman would say, if asked, that there had been more petitions sent up in favour of that Bill than any other this session. It has met with the approval of a very large number of benches of magistrates. No fewer than fifty-four had done what they could to dissuade publicans from selling intoxicating liquors to children.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is justified in calling attention to a Bill, but not in giving all the reasons which may be urged in support of it.

MR. TRITTON: I certainly will not trespass for a moment on your ruling, Mr. Speaker. If Her Majesty's Government cannot see their way to grant a Wednesday for the remaining stages of that Bill, I offer them an alternative course—let them take it up as a Government measure, and crown their many social achievements by passing a Bill which will be fraught with the greatest possible blessing to the young people of this country.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 236; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 145.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Aird, John
Allhusen, Augustus H. E.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness)
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Barry, Rt Hn A H Smith-(Hunts
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)

Bartley, George C. T.
Beach,Rt.Hn.SirM.H(Bristol)
Beach,RtHonW.W.B.(Hants)
Beckett, Ernest William
Bethell, Commander
Biddulph, Michael
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt.H. F.(Middlesex
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, RtHnJ.A.(Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C.W.(Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,JAusten (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw.H.Athole
Cook, Fred Lucas (Lambeth)
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw.T.D.
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalbiac, Col. Philip Hugh
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Digby, J. K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas-Pennant, Hon. E. S.
Drage, Geoffrey
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.
Fergusson, Rt.HnSirJ(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs,HnA.G.H.(City of Lond
Gibbs, Hon. V. (St. Albans)
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gilliat, Jonn Saunders
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. SirJohnEldon
Goschen,RtHnG.J(StGeorge's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gourley, Sir E. Temperley
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Gretton, John
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord Geo.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. R. Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Hatch, Ernest Fredk. George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Rt. Hon. A. S. (Staffs.)
Hoare, E. B. (Hampstead)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Jackson,Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jenkins, Sir John Jones
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lafone, Alfred
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence,SirE.Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky,Rt. Hon. WilliamE. H.
Leigh-Bennett, H. Currie
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn,Sir Dillwyn- (Swan.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Long, Col. Chas.W. (Evesham
Long,RtHnWalter(Liverpool)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, Rt. Hon. Jas. (Kent
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David Liverpool
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh,W.
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E.
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, John Throgm'r'n
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott(Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Morgan,Hn.Fred.(Monm'thsh
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnAGraham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Peel,Hn.William R.Wellesley
Pender, Sir James
Penn, John
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hn. H. Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley,Rt.Hn.Sir MatthewW.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel W.
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell,Gen. F.S.(Cheltenh'm
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Savory, Sir Joseph
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seton-Karr, Henrv
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart,M.H.(Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.
Stanley, Sir H. M. (Lambeth)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strauss, Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Lieut.-Col.C.E.(Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E. (Tantn
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young,Commander (Berks,E.)
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. Henry
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Chas. (Glasgow)
Carew, James Laurence
Causton, Richard Knight
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow
Courtney,Rt.Hon. Leonard H.
Crombie, John William
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, Arthur
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doughty, George
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Sir Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Evans, Sir F. H. (South'ton)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gold, Charles
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir William B.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Hobhouse, Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones,William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Lawson, SirWilfrid (Cumb'lnd
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Sir Leonard
M‘Arthur,William (Cornwall)
M‘Dermott, Patrick
M‘Ewan, William
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mather, William
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Montagu, Sir S. (Whitechapel
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen
Morgan, W. P. (Merthyr)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley,Rt. Hn. J. (Montrose)
Morton, Edw.J.C.(Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Oldroyd, Mark
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Richardson, J. (Durham,S.E.)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich(Leigh)
Sinclair,Capt.John(Forfarsh'e
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Steadman, William Charles
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Edward
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, A. (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Alf. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas. David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas CourtenayT
Wason, Eugene
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John C. (Notts.)
Wills, Sir William Henry
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, J. (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson,J.W.(WorcestershN.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.(Huddersf'ld
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Channing and Mr. Souttar.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport): I beg to insert after the word "on" the words "Tuesday, the 19th." I venture to express the hope, seeing that this is a matter of such extreme importance, of such enormous interest to the public, and of such real urgency, that the right hon. Gentleman will accede to the request made in this motion. Now that we are in sight of a triumphant conclusion to the war in South Africa, I believe there is absolutely no subject whatever that interests the people of this country to a tenth part of the extent that the subject matter of the resolution which will be cut out from the proceedings of to-morrow, unless my Amendment is carried, interests the people. I do not know whether hon. Members quite realise what the urgency of this question is and its importance. It is only a few days ago that a newspaper, which is generally supposed to share and to sympathise with the principles of the party opposite, had a headline, and the announcement made in it was "A Soldier's Reward: Wounded at Modder River, and sent to the Workhouse." I venture to think that, with evidence like that of what is actually taking place in the country now, a sense of disgrace and a sense of shame is felt by the vast majority of the citizens of this Empire. Surely that sense of shame must weigh a hundredfold upon those who have the honour and responsibility of a seat in this House. I venture to think that the responsibility must weigh a thousandfold with the members of Her Majesty's Government. I believe that the mass of the people of this country feel that the absence of care for the wounded soldiers of the war, and the absence of protection and care for the widows and orphans of those who have given their lives to the nation, is a matter that ought to be looked after by the nation. It is not a thing that ought to be left to local administration and the administration of the poor law.

*MR. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. Member was discussing a question which was beyond the scope of the Amendment.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON: Of course I obey your ruling, but I submit to the right hon. Gentleman that there is urgency in this matter. It has been pointed out by my hon. friend when he rose previously to move the Amendment I am now moving that the supply from private charity has already ceased. The amount already received from private charity is altogether inadequate, and considering what I know to be the feeling of the country, almost in every part of it, upon this matter, and with regard to the urgency of it, I venture to beseech the Government to allow us to have one day to discuss it. It is a matter of most vital national importance, especially in view of the fact that our wounded soldiers are now being sent to the workhouse. We have had an instance within the last few days of the way the Government has neglected up to the present to state to the House or the country what provision they intend to make to deal with this vastly important matter.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, after the words 'except on,' to insert the words 'Tuesday the 19th and.'"—(*Mr. Edward Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The speech of the hon. Member is one of the most uncalled for I have ever listened to. No announcement as to the intentions of the Government with respect to this question more satisfactory to the hon. Member than that which has already been made could be elicited by a hundred speeches such as that which he proposes to make.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 93; Noes, 250. (Division List No. 146.)

AYES.

Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Asher, Alexander

Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas

Caldwell, James
Cameron,SirCharles(Glasgow)
Carew, James Laurence
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Crombie, John William
Curran, Thos. B. (Donegal)

Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, Arthur
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William

Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan

Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gold, Charles
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick,Thomas Chas. H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swan.
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)

Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James

Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Sir Leonard

M'Ewan, William
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mather, William
Mellor, Rt. Hn. J. W. (Yorks.)
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Montagu, Sir S. (Whitechapel)
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morgan,W.Pritchard(Merth'r
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Oldroyd, Mark

Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John

Reckitt, Harold James
Richardson, J. (Durham,S.E.)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Sinclair,CaptJohn(Forfarshire
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Steadman, William Charles
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Edward
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)

Thomas, Abel (Camarthen, E.
Thomas,Alfred(Glamorgan,E.
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Wallace, Robert
Warner,Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams,JohnCarvell(Notts.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Hudders'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. E. J. C. Morton and
Mr. Kearley.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Aird, John
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baillie, JamesE. B.(Inverness)
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Barry, Rt. Hn. A. H. S- (Hunts
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants
Beckett, Ernest William
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Biddulph, Michael
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen, Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw. T. D
Courtney, Rt. Hon. L. H.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalbiac, Colonel Philip Hugh
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Donkin, Richard Sim
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas-Pennant, Hon. E. S.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William H.
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fry, Lewis
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gilliatt, John Saunders
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, RtHnG. J. (StGeorge's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gourley, Sir E. Temperley
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Gretton, John
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter Colonel
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge. Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, EdwBrodie(Hampstead
Hobhouse, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Hozier, Hon. J. Henry C.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jackson, Rt. Hn. W. Lawies
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jenkins, Sir John Jones
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Labouchere, Henry
Lafone, Alfred
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, SirDillwyn-(Swans.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclean, James Mackenzie
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Marks, Henry Hananel
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E.
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Hon. J. S. (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.
Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Montrose)
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Myers, William Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alexand'r
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbt. Pike (Darlingt'n)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pender, Sir James
Penn, John
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. Horace C.
Pollock, Harry Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Cheltenham
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Savory, Sir Joseph
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sidebottom, W. (Derbyshire)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Sir H. M. (Lambeth)

Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Thornton, Percy M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Shef.)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Tauntn
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That for the remainder of the session Government business do have precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday (except on Wednesdays the 20th and 27th June), and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 56 be extended to all the days of the week.

NEW BILL.

CUSTOMS DUTIES (ISLE OF MAN).

Bill to amend the Law with respect to Customs Duties in the Isle of Man, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hanbury and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.

CUSTOMS DUTIES (ISLE OF MAN) BILL.

"To amend the Law with respect to Customs Duties in the Isle of Man," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 250.]

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1, 2, 3, and 4 agreed to.

Clause 5:—

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The Amendment which stands first in my name, as well as some other Amendments in my name, are all closely connected. They are all placed on the Paper in connection with the arrangement which, as I stated to the House, had been made with the delegates of the different colonies with regard to the question of appeal. The earlier Amendments are purely verbal, consequential on what is really the only substantial Amendment, that to Clause 74. But as, of course, if the Committee were disinclined to pass the Amendment to Clause 74, these earlier Amendments would be unnecessary, I think it would be convenient that I should take this opportunity of stating our position in the matter. I also think it would be convenient, if there is to be a discussion on the principle—which I rather hope may not be the case—that it should take place on this formal Amendment. I think the question is one of some difficulty and complexity, and, therefore, even at the risk of repetition, I will venture to remind the Committee of what has already passed. The Bill which was sent to us from Australia dealt with the question of appeal in rather a drastic fashion. It practically abolished the ancient appeal to the Privy Council in constitutional cases, except where the public interests of any part of Her Majesty's dominions were concerned. To their proposal the Government, acting as trustees for the Empire, took serious exception. We stated from the first that it would be quite impossible for us to assent to it. We explained that we held it to be our duty to maintain this right of appeal wherever any interests outside Australia were concerned. We stated however, at the same time, that where questions arose which were purely of Australian concern, whatever opinion we might ourselves entertain as to the wisdom of the proposals that were made by the Australian people, we should not think it our duty to interfere or to insist upon any Amendments. We were unable at that time to come to any agreement with the delegates who had been appointed by the five federating States. They were in a somewhat exceptional position, because they had at that time only received a special mandate to carry the Bill exactly in the form in which it was passed by the Australian people. They did not feel themselves competent, therefore, to discuss with us any form of amendment. Accordingly Her Majesty's Government introduced a Bill with our own Amendments. On our own responsibility we restored the right of appeal as it had previously existed. But after we had introduced the Bill in that form, and between the First and Second Readings, we had further communications with the delegates from Australia. Those communications, though not confined to the delegates of the eastern States, were chiefly with them, because the delegate from Queensland had already agreed to our proposal. It was the delegates from the four eastern States who still desired either that the original Bill should be passed in its original form or that some arrangement should be come to as to the Amendments we proposed. The result of those communications with the four delegates was that we came to an arrangement. I have observed that that arrangement is frequently spoken of as a compromise. I think that is altogether an inaccurate expression. As I understand it, a compromise is an amicable understanding between parties who have differed, according to which each party gives up something in order to secure unanimity. But in the present instance I should describe our understanding as an arrangement in which neither party gives up anything to which they attach importance, which I think is a more satisfactory state of things. We, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government at any rate, desired only that the right of appeal should be maintained in all cases in which other than Australian interests were concerned, and that was absolutely conceded to us by the four delegates concerned. They on their part, I will not say exclusively, but at all events mainly, desired that certain constitutional questions which might hereafter arise as to the limits *inter se* of the powers of the States and of the Federal Parliament should be finally decided by the High Court, and that also was secured to them by the agreement at which we arrived. Having arrived at that agreement, we had to communicate it to Queensland, and the Queensland delegate and his Government both objected to the arrangement, as they were prepared to go much further in the direction which indeed commended itself to Her Majesty's Government, although we did not think it our duty to force it on the Australian colonies. I wish the Committee to bear in mind the extraordinary difficulty of the negotiations in which I have been engaged. In the first place I have had to deal with five separate interests, not to speak of the interests of Western Australia and New Zealand, which, not being federating colonies, may be put, perhaps, in the second rank as regards this question. I have had to deal with five separate interests represented with five different colonies. The first difficulty was to ascertain the opinion of those five separate colonies. How was I to ascertain it? I was blamed, rather roughly I think, by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition for, as he said, going behind the delegates in this matter. I am glad to think that they, at any rate, did not take offence at anything which I did; and I think that what has happened since has fully justified my attempt to ascertain from other respectable and influential sources the opinion of the Australian people as well as the opinions of the delegates and the Governments. But if I were to accept the opinions of the delegates as representative of the five Australian colonies, I am met with this difficulty—that the Australian delegates themselves agree in stating that they had no credentials for such a purpose; that they came here with a limited mandate. If, however, I try to get the opinions of the Governments who appointed them I am met with this difficulty—that those Governments, for whatever reasons I am totally unable to divine, have refrained from first to last from giving me any official indication of their opinions. Up to the present day I am still without any official communication whatever in regard to the various proposals which have been under consideration. I say, then, that the position has been one necessarily of some difficulty. The agreement to which I have referred removed all difficulty so far as the Imperial Government was concerned. We have got by that agreement everything that we desire. There remains the necessity, if possible, of satisfying in any

Mr. J. Chamberlain.

final settlement the whole of the five colonies concerned, and in regard to that our position is really a Ministerial one. We have only to ascertain what the wishes of the Australian colonies are, and when we have ascertained them we have to carry them out. To us it is really of no consequence, so far as those Imperial interests go with which we were chiefly concerned, what the decision of the colonies may be. At the time I last addressed the House the position was this. Four colonies out of the five, by the mouths of their delegates, had approved of the agreement at which we had arrived. Therefore I placed on the Paper Amendments to carry out the decision which, although not unanimous, was at all events the decision of the majority of those concerned. Since then, through the usual channels of information—not by virtue of any official communication from any of the Governments concerned —I have learned that the arrangement to which we came is objected to on two grounds. In the first place, the colonies, perhaps with the exception of South Australia—and when I speak of the colonies I am speaking of the Governments of the colonies—appeared to consider that it would limit the right of appeal from the State Courts more than was done by the original Bill. It appears that there is some difficulty in ascertaining what would have been the exact effect of the original Bill. There is some difference of opinion amongst legal authorities in regard to this matter. Some assert that under the original Bill it would have been open to litigants, even where constitutional questions involving the powers of the States were concerned, at their option either to appeal to the Privy Council or to the High Court. Other authorities, on the contrary, say that in regard to those constitutional questions the appeal would only lie to the High Court, and this would be final. I do not pretend to settle that matter. I only say it is not as clear to me as it might be that the original Bill did allow of such an appeal. But at all events, it is clear to me that the general opinion in Australia at the present time is in favour of such an appeal—is in favour, that is to say, of a possible appeal to the Privy Council in cases which arise in the first instance in the State Courts. The second objection taken was that we had provided no appeal should lie from the High Court in such cases, unless the consent of the Governments of the two States or of the State and the Federal Government respectively concerned had been obtained to such an appeal. That appeal would have been by the leave of the Governments concerned who were interested in the settlement of the constitutional question. A serious objection has been taken to that by very distinguished legal authorities in the colonies, and it appears to be supported by the Governments, that it was introducing the executive into judicial questions. That would be a most unfortunate result. As soon as these objections were clearly stated Her Majesty's Government endeavoured to see whether some other changes might not be made which would, as we hoped, secure unanimity, including Queensland as well as the other four colonies, and would satisfy the particular objections that had been taken. We were assisted in our inquiries by the opinion that came to us from Chief Justice Griffiths, in which he suggested certain amendments of the proposed agreement to carry out these objects, and I am glad to say that we have now again, after communication this time with all the five delegates, arrived at a further proposal which does, at any rate, absolutely meet the two objections to which I have referred, and I am not aware of any other objections that have been taken. We propose in the new form of the clause which appears on the White Paper to-day, and which I shall propose at a later stage, that the right of appeal shall be restricted only in a single case—only in the case of a constitutional question arising as to the powers *inter se* between the States or the States and the Federal Government, and arising in the High Court. We strike out altogether all reference to the State Courts, leaving the state of the law on the question of appeal exactly where it was before, and we deal only with exceptional cases arising in the High Court. If I may express in arithmetical terms my own idea of what has happened it is this. Whereas in the original Bill as it was presented to us by the Australians in nine cases out of ten the right of appeal to the Queen in Council would have been restricted, and whereas by an agreement which we came to before the Second Reading, and before the delegates of the eastern States were heard, that right of appeal would have been restricted in perhaps five cases out of ten, now by the new arrangement it will only be restricted in one case out of ten. I do not put that before the Committee as an absolutely accurate statement, but I put it as representing my own view of the changes that have been made. As to one point, however, there can be no doubt whatever, and that is each successive change has been in the direction of the view entertained from the first by Her Majesty's Government. Our rights in the matter lapsed when we got the concession which secured the right of appeal in all cases which were external to purely Australian interests. But our interests in the matter remained because in our conviction it was to the advantage of Australia that it should maintain in the fullest degree this right of appeal, and that they should have thoroughly impartial and authoritative Courts to go to, as Canada can go and as Australia has hitherto gone. One other change has been made, which is also of great importance. We have now, with the consent of the five delegates concerned, substituted the leave of the Court for the leave of the Government. It is now, therefore, a purely judicial affair. In any case, even in a very limited class of cases in which constitutional questions arise—in which purely Australian constitutional questions arise in the High Court—the High Court may give leave to appeal; and, having regard to the unanimous opinion of the highest legal authorities in Australia as to this right of appeal, and apparently to the general conviction on the part of the majority, at any rate, of the legal profession and the majority of the commercial classes, I cannot doubt that in cases of real importance such leave would certainly be given. I have communicated to the whole of the Governments the proposals at which we have arrived. I have also communicated to them the fact that these proposals are recommended unanimously by the delegates in this country, but I have not had up to the present time any official reply from these Governments.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): When did you communicate with them?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: On Saturday. There has been time for a reply, because one or two Governments have communicated, but they have not dealt definitely with this matter. If, however, one may draw a conclusion from other sources, from what has appeared in the newspapers and in reports from Australia, it would seem that the new proposals are likely to give general satisfaction. There is one further remark which I think I ought to make. I owe it to Mr. Dickson to say that while he has joined in recommending this proposal he has stated very fairly that neither he nor I is a lawyer, and that we may as laymen have misapprehended the effect of the proposals. I hope that that is not the case, and I am confirmed I think, in my opinion, as to the effect of these proposals by the stronger and much more valuable opinion of the Attorney General. I think it right to say that Mr. Dickson put forward a *caveat*, that if it should be found that the effect of the new clause is not as I have stated it he would not feel himself bound by the recommendations he has made. I will only add that I think the Committee will understand that while we rejoice very much that the Australians have voluntarily come so far in what we believe is the direction of their true interests in this matter, we desire nothing but to carry out their wishes, whatever they are. Therefore, if it should happen, as it may—although I have no reason to anticipate it—that in the interval between now and the report stage they should unanimously or by a majority desire any further change, always provided it does not interfere with the Imperial interests already guarded, I shall be prepared to propose such change to the Committee. I am not, therefore, binding myself to an absolutely final arrangement. That is a matter which, in my opinion, rests with the Australian colonies. I only ask the Committee now to pass in the form in which I put them forward the Amendments before the House, believing at all events they will go a long way in the direction of satisfying all the interests concerned.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, to leave out from the word 'Notwithstanding,' to the word 'State,' in line 18, both inclusive."—(*Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): The right hon. Gentleman has quite reasonably proposed to take the discussion on the new proposal of the Government at this moment, although it comes long before we reach Clause 74. When the right hon. Gentleman went on to suggest, as I understood him, that in this proposal there was really nothing calling for a prolonged discussion, I, for one, am unable to agree with him. Looking at the clause which he now proposes, it seems to me that the position which he takes up is widely different from the position he took up upon the First Reading. I feel all the more encouraged to call the attention of the Committee to this fact, because we are placed in a most extraordinary position by the course adopted by the right hon. Gentleman. What is that position ? The clause which we are now called upon to debate is one which most of us have seen only within the last few hours. It was not on the Blue Paper, for on that Paper there appears a clause which has been printed, and which has been there for upwards of three weeks. Therefore, we have all been entitled to assume that that was the clause which indicated the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman, and we have been encouraged in that belief because it remained there and was circulated as late as Saturday morning last, notwithstanding the storm of adverse criticism by which it was received by almost every Government in Australia.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. Gentleman, but I ask him to bear in mind that we have yet had no official criticism from any of the Governments to which he alludes.

*MR. HALDANE: I know that the right hon. Gentleman himself has rather an affection for newspaper reports and telegrams, and I collected a considerable bundle of opinions and criticisms on this subject which appeared in *The Times* and other newspapers, as telegraphed from Australia, and which certainly did indicate very great dissatisfaction with the clause as it appeared on the Blue Paper. I believed until a very recent time—for it so happens that I had information in advance—that the clause as it appeared on the Blue Paper was the clause which we were going to discuss. But within the last few hours there has been circulated another Paper containing a totally different clause, and one which falls very far short of what the right hon. Gentleman laid down as his standard in the discussion on the First Reading of the Bill. I say at once that I enter upon this discussion with the strong desire that this should not be made in any sense a contentious Bill. We all wish to get it through, and I will simply remind the Committee how most of those hon. Members who are with me regard this Bill as a whole. We felt that, so far as Australia was concerned, it was for the Australians to shape the measure in their own fashion. We felt that with regard to the question of the right of appeal it was an important question, which ought not to have been allowed to rise, and would not have arisen if, two years ago, when this question first came forward, the Government had been a little more in earnest about creating an Imperial Court of Appeal. Had this been done we should probably not have had these difficulties with which we are face to face at this moment. My contention is that the Amendment now brought forward is more objectionable, as affecting Imperial interests and the scope and power of the Privy Council, than the clause as it originally stood. I desire to put it in as simple language as possible. Let me remind the House what the various stages of this matter have been. Clause 74, as it was brought forward by the Delegates, provided that no appeal should be permitted in regard to any question of the interpretation of the Constitution unless that question involved the public interest of Her Majesty's dominions outside Australia. In other words, where the public interest of Her Majesty's dominions outside Australia are concerned it was proposed that there should be an appeal to the Privy Council. My chief complaint against the new clause is that the right hon. Gentleman has dropped out of this question all reference to questions of public interest in Her Majesty's dominions outside Australia, and has substituted a definition which does not cover the same field, and which precludes from the review of the Privy Council a number of questions which may be of very great Imperial moment, and for which no provision is made in the words of the right hon. Gentleman's new clause. The first Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman made was after the debate on the Second Reading. In the debate on the First Reading the right hon. Gentleman had laid down his position very plainly. He said on the 14th of May last—

"What I say is that there is no such unanimity as should make us hesitate in a matter of this vast importance, at all events, to take time, and, for the present at any rate, retain the right of appeal as it now exists."

Some of us thought that was going too far, but on the 21st of May last he announced for the first time his compromise, and he said—

"The effect of this understanding will be that Clause 74 will be exactly reversed; that whereas in the original clause appeal was to cease in all cases except where the public interests of some portion of Her Majesty's dominions outside Australia were concerned, in the clause as we now propose to insert it, an appeal will lie in every case except in these cases in which Australian interests alone are concerned. That, I think, gets rid of practically every one of the difficulties I anticipated when I referred to the original clause in introducing the Bill."

Now my right hon friend the Member for East Fife, who followed the right hon. Gentleman in that debate, naturally received the right hon. Gentleman's explanation with some reserve, although we were all glad to know that something in the nature of a compromise had been arrived at. But what we have here is not a compromise. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that a compromise is a transaction between parties who have differed and in which something is given up by each party in order to secure unanimity. In this case the right hon. Gentleman not only gives up that which is claimed, but he also gives up something which was not asked for. The right hon. Gentleman's proposal gives up now the exception of public interest—which was conceded by the delegates—affecting the Queen's dominions outside Australia, an exception which never was in controversy, and he has introduced a clause excluding this right. Both under the clause which the right hon. Gentleman first proposed, and under the clause which he now proposes, he excludes from the Privy Council important questions which would have been included in the proposals as originally drafted by the delegates. The first proposal of the right hon. Gentleman declared that no question—

"as to the limits *inter se* of the constitutional powers of the Commonwealth and those of any State or States, or as to the limits *inter se* of the constitutional powers of any two or more States shall be capable of final decision except by the High Court, and no appeal shall be permitted to the Queen in Council from any decision of the High Court on any such question unless by the consent of the Executive Government or Governments concerned, to be signified in writing."

That is the clause which was so fiercely assailed in Australia. In the first place it has been said that there was there an objectionable provision in regard to the introduction of the Executive Governments into matters of judicial concern. I do not wonder that that proposal raised a storm of hostile criticism in Australia. But there is another point, and it is in regard to the expression "final decision." It was pointed out that this clause applied not only to public controversies between Governments, but that it applied also to private litigation, and that if the clause passed, a private litigant might find himself in this position; he had fought his case and been unsuccessful, and his opponent had taken him to the Privy Council or he had taken his opponent there. There somebody raises the contention that there is a question of the limits, *inter se*, of the legislative powers of the two Governments and the validity of the Colonial Act may be questioned. In such a case the Privy Council would have been bound to say, under the wording of the clause, "we cannot listen to you, for we are precluded from hearing the case, and we are bound to send it to the High Court." That was felt to be a clause which was altogether intolerable, and it has been made the subject of severe criticism. Now that obnoxious expression "final decision" has been got rid of, I am glad to say, and now we are face to face with a new clause which has appeared on the Paper for the first time to-day.

"No appeal shall be permitted to the Queen in Council from a decision of the High Court upon any question howsoever arising as to the limits *inter se* of the Constitutional powers of the Commonwealth and those of any State or States, or as to the limits *inter se* of the Constitutional powers of any two or more States, unless the High Court shall certify that the question is one which ought to be determined by Her Majesty in Council."

It is quite true that there is a class of question which was excluded by the original clause of the delegates which this clause permits. For instance, suppose there arises a question under the power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government extended by the specific provisions of Clause 51 outside the region of Australia, and outside territorial limits—the question would arise as to whether legislation in the colony would be *ultra vires.* Now under the proposal made by the right hon. Gentleman that would be appealable which could not have been so under the original clause. But this is a very rare case. I have had some experience in these matters in Canada, and during an observation extending over fifteen years I do not know a single instance of such a question arising. I know of an instance arising in the case of one of the Australasian colonies as to a bigamy law which was said to have been passed in such terms as to extend to an offence committed outside the limits of Australia, and the Privy Council held that the effective scope of the statute did not extend outside those limits. But not one question in a hundred which arise will be of this nature, but questions of another class will arise constantly. Let me take a concrete case which arose within my own knowledge with regard to British Columbia. Litigation arose there in reference to the employment of Chinese labour in a colliery. A Bill had been brought before the legislature for the prohibition of female and child labour in mines, and someone moved an amendment to add the words "and Chinamen" to this prohibition. The shareholders, finding that Chinamen were being employed, brought the question before the court, applying for an injunction. When this litigation arose some ingenious person in the case raised the objection that power to legislate for aliens was reserved exclusively to the Dominion Parliament, and that the legislation of British Columbia was *ultra vires.* The point was one of importance because there was a treaty between Her Majesty and the Emperor of China which gave the most-favoured-nation treatment to Chinese subjects, and there was a question as to whether this was not affected by the legislation alluded to. This was a question affecting the Queen's dominions outside Canada, and the matter came before the Privy Council, and they declared that the legislation was *ultra vires,* and in that way they got rid of the matter. I will take another illustration. There was a great case about eighteen months ago between Ontario and Quebec and the Dominion Government, which arose in regard to the control over the great lakes and the great rivers in Canada. That was a matter in which the Imperial Government were interested, because it was a question in which the rights of the American as well as the Canadian fishermen were involved. It was felt that the matter should not be left in the hands of the provincial Government, having regard to the complications which might arise. The matter came before the Privy Council, and it was ultimately decided that it was not within the power of any Province of Canada to deal with this matter at all. I give these illustrations because they are cases which arose undoubtedly as to the limits *inter se* of the constitutional powers in the Dominion of Canada. I think the Committee will appreciate the reason why I do this. These were cases where the public interest of the Queen's dominions outside Canada were vitally concerned, and in which there was a right of appeal under the Constitution. Such cases may arise in relation to Australia, and in such an emergency there would have been a right of appeal under the Bill which the delegates introduced, but there will be no such appeal under the clause which the right hon. Gentleman has presented to the House. That seems to me to be a consideration which, at all events, should entitle us at this stage to ask for a little more time than we have had to consider a clause which hardly one of us saw before a few hours ago, and which now comes before us for discussion practically for the first time. It is quite true that the clause of the right hon. Gentleman has some advantages—for example, it makes it clear that there can be an appeal from the State Court even upon a constitutional question to the Privy Council. I think that was probably not so under the Bill as it originally stood, but what an extraordinary provision it is. The clause provides that if you have litigation in the State upon a constitutional question you may appeal either to the Privy Council or the High Court. If you appeal to the High Court the decision is to be final unless the High Court gives you leave to appeal to the Privy Council. It is, in other words, a court of final jurisdiction upon this matter. Supposing a litigant takes his case first to the Privy Council and succeeds, his opponent may, in another case, raising the same point, take him up to the High Court to get round the difficulty, which he can do because the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman gives him a right of appeal. But that is a totally different appeal to the one in Canada, because there the Supreme Court is not a court of final jurisdiction. As the clause makes the High Court of Australia a court of final jurisdiction, there may well be conflicting decisions between the High Court and the Privy Council. I do not think that is an academic matter. I for one protest against pronouncing an opinion upon this question with only a few hours consideration, and without an opportunity of anything like full discussion. It may be said that these matters are more or less technical; but, after all, what is there in this measure about which there is any controversy except this right of appeal to the Privy Council? I am not one of those who ever have insisted upon that right. I am quite prepared to say that the views of the delegates are entitled to great weight, and I am prepared to allow the people of Australia to prefer the decision of the Australian Courts upon questions affecting the interpretation of the Constitution. But what I do protest against is the right hon. Gentleman coming here and taking a high constitutional attitude and telling us that the right of appeal was to remain as it stood, and then coming down here with a clause which gives away more than the delegates ever asked for. It seems to me that what we have got here is not a compromise at all. Surely we ought to have a little more time to consider these matters more fully than is possible at the present moment. There are vital questions involved in this Bill which concern not merely the Government of Australia but they affect Imperial interests as well, and we ought to be allowed sufficient time to make up our minds in a satisfactory manner. I am aware that the right hon. Gentleman has had a most difficult task in negotiating this matter, but I protest against the way in which the right hon. Gentleman is asking Parliament to come to a decision in this matter, just as if the issue was a comparatively simple one.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I was very glad to hear the hon. and learned Gentleman urge that this Bill should not be treated as a contentious Bill, and I am quite sure it will not be so regarded. At the same time I was a little bewildered by the hon. and learned Gentleman's attitude on this Amendment. The hon. and learned Gentleman says that this clause gives the delegates more than they ever asked for—that so far from being a compromise it gives them all they originally asked for and something more. That is the proposition of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

MR. HALDANE: I did not say all, but I quite admit that something has been added, although it is very small.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I am glad to hear that qualification, although the statement in the hon. and learned Gentleman's speech was that the clause was not a compromise, and that it gave the delegates all that they asked for and something more. I am satisfied that not only is the view propounded by the hon. and learned Gentleman absolutely novel, but that it is one which will not commend itself to anyone who has studied the matter at all. I would remind the hon. and learned Member that when this Bill, in the form in which it came from Australia, was under consideration in the House the hon. and learned Member suggested that it should be accepted in the form in which it came from Australia. I am not going to occupy the time of the Committee with technical matters, but a reference to the broad features of the Bill will show that the hon. and learned Member's view with regard to the comparative effect of the Amendment before the Committee is really without any substantial foundation. It is not of very much use to appeal in this matter to experience gathered in other fields, because in this Bill we have to deal with enactments of a very peculiar and very special kind. I will ask the Committee to refer to the terms of the Constitution. They confer upon the Parliament of the Commonwealth power to make laws with regard to a great many matters, and I will direct attention to two or three of them, as showing the class of questions which might arise. Under Head 10 power is given to make laws as to fisheries in Australian waters beyond the territorial limits. Head 29 refers to external affairs, and Head 30 to the relations of the Commonwealth with the Islands of the Pacific. There are several others which I might mention, but these are sufficient for my purpose. With regard to every one of these heads, questions of very great gravity might arise as to the extent of the powers which have been conferred upon the Parliament of the Commonwealth. Take the question of the power to deal with Australian fisheries beyond territorial limits. The question might arise, what are Australian fisheries not within the territorial limits? What are the powers to be exercised with regard to the persons who may frequent these fisheries? With regard to external affairs it is unnecessary to point out the wide scope that might be attributed to words of that kind. In connection with all these heads questions of very great importance as to the extent of the delegation to be conferred on the Parliament of the Commonwealth might arise. I cannot at all agree with my hon. and learned friend that only in very exceptional cases questions as to the extent of these powers would arise. I venture to say that they would arise in nine cases out of ten. What I desire to draw the attention of the Committee to is this—that the question of what powers have been delegated to the Australian legislatures, whether the legislatures in common or the legislature in each State, may be matter of grave Imperial concern; but how these powers, having been delegated, are to be distributed as between the central and the local legislatures will be almost invariably a matter of Australian concern. It may be of the utmost possible importance to determine accurately what is the extent of the powers delegated under Article 51. But the question whether a certain power is to be exercised by the central legislature or the local legislature is a question of Australian importance and almost entirely of Australian importance. My hon. and learned friend says the Bill as it came from Australia provided that in matters affecting the public interest of some other part of Her Majesty's dominions an appeal would be allowed. That is perfectly true. I do not intend to comment upon the extreme vagueness of such language as "the public interest of some other part of Her Majesty's dominions," but it is language which would introduce uncertainty into a class of cases where certainty is eminently desirable. No one would know what was covered by that assumption, but when my hon. and learned friend looks back with regret to these words which appear in the Bill as it came from Australia he forgets altogether that there was an exception engrafted on the prohibition of the right to appeal. The prohibition of the right of appeal extended to all constitutional questions. It was provided by Article 74 as it came from Australia that no appeal on any question affecting the construction of the Constitution would lie except where the public interest of some other part of Her Majesty's dominions was concerned. Now we, by this clause, eliminate altogether the prohibition of appeal on constitutional questions generally, and we confine the prohibition to the one case of conflict as between a State and the Commonwealth or as between two States, as to by which of them the power conferred should be exercised. If the question is whether the power is to be delegated at all, then an appeal would lie subject to leave from Her Majesty. But if the question is not one of delegation, but merely of distribution, and as to whether, the powers having been conceded, they are to be exercised by the central or the local legislature, then there is no appeal from the decision of the High Court, unless the High Court thinks fit for special reasons to certify an appeal. My hon. and learned friend put a case which I confess rather surprised me. He said, and it is the case, that this clause as it now stands leaves absolutely unfettered the right of appeal to the Privy Council. As the Bill stands any litigant may take any point including constitutional questions of this kind straight from the Supreme Court of the State to the Privy Council. There is no doubt about that at all. Then my hon. and learned friend asks what would happen, suppose a litigant takes a point of that kind to the Privy Council and it is decided, and that the same point arises in another case and is taken to the High Court. In that case, of course, the High Court will follow, and would be bound to follow the decision given by the Privy Council.

MR. HALDANE: Does the Privy Council also follow the High Court?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Certainly not, because it is not usual for the

Appelate Court to follow the Court below. The very clause which my hon. and learned friend has been criticising provides that, should the High Court think fit to certify that the case is one proper to be heard on appeal, then the case may go to the Privy Council. I do ask the Committee whether a more extraordinary proposition was ever put forward than that, after the Privy Council, to which the High Court was allowed to appeal, had decided a particular point in one way, the High Court should decide the same point in another way and refuse leave to appeal to the Privy Council. I venture to say that a graver observation touching the constitution of a Court never was made. If there were any special circumstances which led the High Court to think that the decision of the Privy Council in the first case was not altogether applicable in the second case, they would of course under these circumstances grant leave to appeal, and the matter would come before the Privy Council. This clause shows that the Privy Council is recognised as the ultimate Appellate Court, altogether in deference to Australian feeling, only for special reasons, and that the High Court is to certify before there can be an appeal. I venture to think that the case quoted by my hon. and learned friend is a perfectly impossible one, and that something in the nature of apology is due to the prospective High Court from him. Then my hon. and learned friend put a very interesting case of legislation with respect to Chinese labour as a case of conflict between a local and central authority in which it would be important that there should be an appeal. I would remind my hon. and learned friend that in the Bill as it came from Australia, it was very far indeed from being clear that there would have been an appeal in such a case. I doubt whether it could have been held that "the public interest of some other part of Her Majesty's dominions was concerned," or that the case would be considered as coming within the exception giving the right of appeal. The case, however, is one of the most exceptional character. I venture to think that we have dealt with nine-tenths of the cases which will arise under the constitution. As to how the powers delegated are to be distributed in Australia the Imperial Government is, as a rule, not concerned. My hon. and learned friend also said that there ought to be time to consider the effect of this clause. I recognise the weight of any suggestion from my hon. and learned friend, but I would remind him, and I would remind the Committee, that there is a very strong desire in Australia that there should be no further delay in the prosecution of this measure. I would also remind the Committee that there will be a further opportunity, after this Bill has passed through Committee, of discussing questions of importance on Report.

MR. HALDANE: I understand that the Australian States have not expressed any opinion on this Amendment. It was only drafted on Saturday and cabled out on Saturday night, and now, on Monday, we are asked to accept it.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I would ask my hon. and learned friend not to forget that there is a very great desire in Australia that this Bill should be passed with reasonable expedition. What that expedition is will be for the Committee to decide. One observation before I sit down. I much regret that my hon. and learned friend seems to be under the impression that this Amendment put on the Paper by the right hon. Gentleman introduces an alternative appeal to the Privy Council or the High Court.

MR. HALDANE: That was in the last edition but one.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: It is embodied in this Amendment, and was introduced in the last Amendment as well.

MR. HALDANE: We did not know what it was.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: That is not the point. The point is that my hon. and learned friend says that an alternative appeal is introduced, and he drew a ghastly picture of what might result from a litigant going from one Court to another. But my hon. and learned friend must remember that the Bill as it came from Australia provided for that alternative appeal.

MR. HALDANE: I said so, because there was an appeal in all cases, except constitutional cases, in the Bill as it came from Australia. But you have now taken away the right of the Privy Council to give leave to appeal, and you make the High Court the supreme court in constitutional questions.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I do not think that my hon. and learned friend appreciates my point. He put it that the evil of an alternative appeal was the result of something done by my right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies. The alternative appeal was in the Bill as it came from Australia. Under that Bill a litigant might go from the Supreme Court of the State straight to the Privy Council on any constitutional question, or instead of going to the Privy Council might go straight to the High Court, but there was this most objectionable state of things under that provision, that unless the matter fell within the exception namely as a constitutional matter affecting public grounds, the decision of the High Court was absolutely final. Under the Bill as it came from Australia it might well have been said that the High Court and the Privy Council were courts of co-ordinate jurisdiction and that the High Court had leave to go its own way. So far from having introduced that evil, what my hon. friend has done as the result of negotiations has been to remove all objectionable results from it, because it is now provided that the High Court may for special reasons grant leave to appeal even in the very limited class of cases in which the decision of the High Court is promulgated as one not the subject of appeal to the Privy Council. I do not claim to have converted my hon. and learned friend on this subject, but I hope I have satisfied the Committee that the sacrifice of these words which he so much laments, "unless the public interest in some other part of Her Majesty's dominions is concerned," is not one to be regretted at all. We have reserved the right of appeal in nine-tenths of the cases which may arise, and all we have done is to provide for no appeal except by special leave in a very limited class of cases—in which 999 out of every 1,000 would not be affected—relating to purely Australian matters.

SIR R. T. REID (Dumfriesshire): I think it is much to be regretted in regard to this debate that it should have ever been necessary. We recognise the difficulties the Colonial Secretary has had to contend with, but the more we think over the matter the more we must regret that it was thought necessary in any degree to interfere with the measure as it was sent from Australia. Let us see for a single moment how the matter stands. There was very great difficulty in the Australian colonies in coming to a concordance upon terms. A long time was lost and a great deal of labour and ingenuity was spent, and at last the colonies came to an agreement. The result of that agreement was sent over to this country. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies unfortunately considered that it was necessary to make an alteration with regard to one subject, and that was the matter of appeal to the Privy Council. With the aid of the most expert legal advice, with the goodwill and assistance of the delegates from Australia, we have proceeded from one suggestion to a second, and then to a third, and at last we have to-day a still further alteration proposed to us, without being able to claim the assent of the Australian Governments or the Australian colonies to anything except what was originally proposed. It has been considered apparently by the legal advisers of the Government that some alteration was necessary in order to preserve the right of appeal to the Privy Council. I want the Committee to consider for a moment what is the real importance of appeal to the Privy Council. I think it is a very desirable thing to retain if we can, but I think it ought never to be imposed on the colonies, unless they wished it. I do not attach any great Imperial or constitutional importance to the preservation of the right of appeal by private individuals in matters of private importance to them. It is only when matters of public importance arise that any significance attaches to the right of appeal. What is the difference between the present proposals of the Government and the proposals made in the original Bill as sent over from Australia? According to the original Bill, in every private case—and these would be the great majority—unless a question as to the interpretation of the constitution arose, the right of appeal was preserved. That is to say, that the right of appeal was proposed by the Australians themselves to be reserved in eighteen out of twenty, and even ninety-nine out of every hundred cases in any way likely to come over to this country, and the only restriction proposed upon the right of appeal was when questions of constitutional interpretation arose under the Act, which must be comparatively rare. But it was thought by the Australians that the right of finally deciding the interpretation of their own Constitution should rest upon themselves. They also made the concession that if the public interest of any other part of Her Majesty's dominions was involved there might be the right of appeal. That was to be a question for the Privy Council to determine. I do not at all doubt that strong legal advice was pressed upon the right hon. Gentleman by very eminent authorities, but it seems to me that the restriction on the right of appeal as originally proposed by the Australians themselves must only affect and could only apply in a few cases. However, unfortunately, the view of the Government was otherwise, and they commenced to make alterations. As the Committee is aware, we have had not much notice of the last alteration, but we will have an opportunity of discussing and considering it again on the Report stage. From the time when the original proposals were first made to the present there has been nothing but difference – friendly and respectful I quite admit—between the Government on the one side and one section or another of Australian opinion on the other. There has been, unfortunately, differences between the Australian colonies themselves in regard to what, after all, are very small matters in comparison with the enormous interests dealt with by this Bill. I would wish to point out to the Committee how comparatively small the real difference is between what was originally proposed in the Australian Bill and what is now suggested by the right hon. Gentleman. There was no restriction at all under the Australian Bill except in cases of constitutional interpretation, and even then there was no restriction if the public interest in any other part of Her Majesty's dominions was concerned. What have we got instead of that? I think myself that the difference is so small as not to justify all the trouble that has been taken and the risk which has been run of losing the Bill. The proposal now is that on questions of constitutional interpretation there shall be no appeal unless the High Court certifies an appeal. That is a difference which it seems to me ought not to occasion any difficulty. If I were an Australian I would very likely consider it a very proper clause; but I think it is a great pity that it was ever proposed here. The right hon. Gentleman says that he does not now know whether the Australian Governments are in favour of his proposal, and that he may learn between now and Report that some other scheme will be satisfactory to them, in which case he says—and most wisely says—that he will instantly lay it before the House provided it does not interfere with his views as to the duty of the Imperial Government as trustees for the whole Empire. I most heartily hope that some proposal will be made—nothing could be more eminently satisfactory, from my point of view, than that some proposal should be made—to put an end to this difference—a difference which I think is very trifling—on a very important Bill, and which has given a great deal more trouble than it need have done. But if not, I think the Australian colonies would be very well advised if they accepted the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. It will do no harm, I believe, to their Constitution, and certainly it contains no element of injustice or unfairness. But if they do not do so, and continue to express, what exists to a considerable extent in Australia, a decided preference for the form of the Bill to which they all agreed in the first instance, I would express the hope that the Government even now, after having done their best according to their own view of their duty, will revert to the Australian view, which I think is perfectly harmless and cannot in any degree interfere with Imperial interests.

Sir R. T. Reid.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): The right hon. the Colonial Secretary said he hoped that any discussion that took place this evening would be on this particular clause, but as my criticism will rather point to a suggestion of a slight increase in the legislative power given in the clause, I hope I shall not be out of order in making some general remarks on the subject. I do not wish to go into the question of the delegation or distribution of powers. I followed the difficulties and the subtleties of the hon. and learned Member for East Lothian, and was painfully convinced by the arguments of the Attorney General that his fears were unfounded. I, however, pass from that, and will venture, in spite of all that has been said as to the propriety of our leaving the matter entirely to the Australians, to express, what I hope is not improper, some interest in the working of this Constitution as we expect it to develop in the future history of the colonies. The Appeal clause in the Bill originally submitted by the colonies to the Government was extremely difficult to allow in the form in which it was drawn, because it was so complicated and obscure that it was likely to lead to bickering and difficulty between the home Government and the colonies. I preferred the clause which was submitted to us shortly after the Bill was introduced, though it appeared to me to have some defects which, if it were before us now, I should have pointed out as a source of danger. The present clause seems to me to confine the matters on which there is to be no review of the Privy Council to very distinct and reasonable limits, and I only regret that the Government departed from what I still think was a counsel of perfection when they first presented the Bill to the House—the retention of the right of appeal as it exists, I believe, for the Dominion of Canada. I wish to impress on this House that we are throwing upon this High Court the decision without review of questions which are very likely to impair its character and its utility in the Australian colonies. The questions that will come before it are questions as to the distribution of power between the Federal Government and the States, and anyone who has followed the history of the Supreme Court in America must know that these are the questions which have most tried the firmness, and have even to some extent impaired the character, of that Court. The cases which will come before the High Court under this clause without doubt will be cases in which the Federal Legislature or the Executive will be alleged to have exceeded its powers as against some one of the States; and, therefore, the issue will be to some extent a political issue. They are the more likely to arise because it must be remembered that the Australian colonies are not going into this federation from any external pressure, but of their own initiative, and because they believe that their voice will sound with greater force and volume in the affairs of the Empire as a Commonwealth than as separate colonies. The cases which will come before the High Court will be cases in which the Legislature or the Executive of the Commonwealth will be one of the litigants, and a State or States will be the other. But it must be borne in mind that the appointment of the judges of the High Court will rest with the Executive of the Commonwealth; and there is no limit to the number constituting the High Court. Thus it is conceivable that when some great political issue as to the federal power is before the Court, or is likely to come before it, it may happen—as I believe it has happened in the United States—that the members of the Court would be gradually increased or diminished according to the wish of the Executive, so that a particular decision or course of policy of a certain character may be determined and arrived at in a certain way. This consideration points to the desirableness of securing the High Court from any possible imputation on its character by granting an appeal to the Privy Council; and if this were done no conceivable motive or reason for affecting the composition of the Court could arise. Though it seems paradoxical to say so, the very fact that the decisions were subject to appeal, and were not to be final, would, I believe, increase the finality of their character—that is to say, they would be accepted without hesitation because they would be above suspicion, inasmuch as the ultimate decision would lie with the Privy Council. I wish it were possible to go back to the original decision of the Government to retain the right of appeal in all cases; but as this is no longer possible I venture to suggest that the Federal Legislature should have power, without an amendment of the Constitution, to restore the right of appeal in those political and constitutional cases which were defined in the amending clause. If, after a term of years, it is found that the character of the High Court is suffering, it might well be that the Commonwealth Parliament might desire to restore the right of appeal to the Privy Council, but it could not do so without the very cumbersome process of amending the Constitution. If, however, the delegates were agreed on that subject a few amending words would give the Commonwealth Parliament the power I suggest. That would be of the greatest advantage. I know that it is risky to prophesy regarding the working of a Constitution, because no Constitution ever worked out as its authors or students ever expected; but I think that my suggestion would be an assistance in the working out of the Australian Constitution, and might be found useful for preventing any possible diminution in the respect which we all hope will be granted to the High Court of the Commonwealth. I do not think that in making this suggestion I can be accused of giving any cause of offence. It seems to me not to be friendly or hardly altogether respectful to the colonies to say, "Take your Constitution if you want it, so long as it does not interfere with Imperial concerns, and make the best of it." We are all interested in the character and conditions of this Australian Constitution; and we are all desirous to see the stones of the fabric laid on the surest foundation, and to promote the ultimate prosperity of these great colonies in which we are so much concerned; and it is for that reason I have ventured to make the suggestion.

*MR. ASQUITH: I think the Committee will realise that we are approaching the consideration of a question of the highest importance under conditions of grave embarrassment. We are, on both sides of the House, I believe, equally impressed with the desire to put no obstacle of any kind in the way of the speedy attainment by our Australian fellow-subjects of a scheme of federation, but I think we might be well advised in the circumstances of the case in asking you, Sir, to report progress and to ask leave to sit again. The House has heard the speech of my hon. and learned friend the Member for Haddingtonshire and the reply of the Attorney General. My hon. and learned friend is of opinion that the clause in the form it has at present assumed does not safeguard the interests of the rest of the Empire as distinguished from Australia with the same clearness and efficiency as the clause which came from Australia The Attorney General is of a different opinion. Again, my hon. and learned friend contends that you may have under this clause two irreconcilable decisions, one by the Privy Council and the other by the High Court in Australia, in reference to the same subject matter in the same State. The Attorney General thinks, I do not know upon what ground, that the High Court would be bound to defer to the Privy Council. I do not wish to pronounce any opinion upon either of these contentions, but when we are asked to pass a clause which did not appear in print until four o'clock this afternoon, and in regard to the interpretation of which these high authorities are in complete antagonism, it is surely placing a very great tax upon the confidence of the House. Even if we had been considering a Private Bill, and not a Constitution, we should have had an opportunity of careful deliberation and of arriving at an opinion which would then be, possibly, of some value. I hope I shall not be accused by anyone of wishing to delay the passage of this Bill or of disrespect either to the Imperial Government or the delegates who have been concerned in these negotiations if I refer to the history of this clause as not creditable to our way of doing business. What does it consist of? The Bill in its original shape, as it was brought from Australia, was submitted to the whole of the Australian people, after prolonged deliberations in their various Legislatures. The Imperial Government, as we now know, took no effective means of conveying to the Australian people what, a moment after the Bill arrived here, they discovered to be a matter of Imperial concern and a real danger to the unity of the Empire. The Australian people having passed the Bill in the shape in which it was passed without any warning whatsoever that apprehensions of that kind had been or were about to be entertained upon this side of the water, the delegates came over here with a restricted mandate, having no power to do anything, as it appeared, but to agree to pass the Bill in the form in which it was assented to by the Australian people. That is the first stage of the matter. Then we come to the First Reading of the Bill in this House, when the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary devoted a very large part of his speech to showing that the Australian delegates were not authentic exponents of the opinion of Australia, that that opinion could be better collected from other sources, which he specified, and that that opinion was hostile to the clause as it was passed upon referendum to the Australian people, and was in favour of an unrestricted right of appeal. The Bill as it was presented to this House on the First Reading gave an absolutely unrestricted right of appeal. That was the second stage. A week later came the Second Reading, when the matter assumed a third and totally different aspect. The delegates, who had had a restricted mandate which did not authorise them to alter a single comma in the Bill, appear to have agreed with the right hon. Gentleman to a form of clause which was totally inconsistent with the position taken up by him on the First Reading of the Bill, and imposed on the right of appeal those very restrictions which he had declared to be fatal or dangerous to the unity of the Empire or to the interests of the Empire. The House will remember the speech the right hon. Gentleman delivered.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I think the right hon. Gentleman misunderstands me. I never said that the restrictions on the right of appeal in purely Australian cases would affect the interests of the Empire, and it is to that we have now absolutely confined this Bill.

*MR. ASQUITH: My argument is, of course, directed to Clause 74, which never did anything at all to restrict the right of appeal except in relation to constitutional questions. The right hon. Gentleman knows that the general right of appeal has always been unimpaired. That was the third phase. I spoke upon that occasion, and I welcomed the understanding which had been arrived at between the right hon. Gentleman and the delegates, because I thought that far too much fuss had been made over this business, and if any arrangement was come to the House might readily assent to it. Now we come to the fourth stage in the history of this transaction. The clause which represented, I will not call it the compromise, but the arrangement come to between the right hon. Gentleman and the unauthorised delegates at the time of the Second Reading, which had been on the Paper for three weeks, and which had been the subject of comment and discussion not only in Australia but in this country, completely disappeared as late as Saturday morning last; and we have had put before us this afternoon, without any notice, a clause containing an entirely different proposition. I think it is a distinct improvement, but it is an entirely new proposition, and we have never had an opportunity of considering it. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that on Saturday, though he had the knowledge that the delegates had absolutely no authority to assent to this clause, he had telegraphed to the Australian Governments to know whether they had assented to it, and at this moment he is entirely without information from any one of those Governments, who alone are in a position to say whether this clause is contrary to the opinion of Australia or not. For the House, in such conditions, to seriously discuss in a Bill like this a clause of such vital importance is entirely without precedent, and if a precedent of this kind is to be made it ought not to be made without a protest in the House itself. When we get to the report stage it may turn out that the Australian Governments do not approve of the action of the delegates, and we may have put before us a fifth and different proposal. I do think that the House has hardly been treated with the respect to which it is entitled in a matter of this gravity. It would have been the easiest thing in the world, if the Colonial Secretary only made this arrangement as late as Saturday last, to have deferred the Committee on this Bill for a few days, until we had an opportunity of knowing what the opinion of Australia was, and also some opportunity of considering ourselves these difficult and legal considerations. For my part I entirely decline at this stage to commit myself to the clause as it stands. I claim for myself, and I think every Member of the House is entitled to it, complete freedom, at a later stage, to consider it upon its merits. I do not think that we should be doing our duty if we allowed this occasion to pass without making this protest against a proceeding which I think is entirely without precedent.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I sympathise very much with a great deal of what has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman as to a certain inconvenience attending the proceedings with regard to this Bill, and I quite agree with him that the circumstances are entirely unprecedented. I quite agree with him also that if we were dealing with a Bill of our own, an English Bill, even a Private Bill, we could not think for a moment of pressing for a conclusion this afternoon, but would readily accept a suggestion coming from any quarter of the House for a further postponement. I admit all that. But how the right hon. Gentleman, who knows the circumstances of this case, and knows exactly what are the difficulties with which I have had to deal, can accuse me of want of respect to the House because I have adopted the course I have taken, I cannot possibly conceive. I have taken this course simply because I have been requested to do so by the Australian delegates. To the right hon. Gentleman that may be an insufficient authority, but for those who again and again in these proceedings have called upon us not to flout the opinion of the whole of the Australian people, not to flout their representatives, not to insult them by suggesting amendments to their Bill, to say to us that no attention whatever should have been paid to the unanimous request of the Australian delegates, even at this late period, seems to me a very inconsistent argument.

*Mr. ASQUITH: What I said was that surely the House of Commons is entitled to have a few days to consider the proposal.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I entirely agree that if the House of Commons desires a postponement they must have it. Nobody would think of rejecting anything like a general desire of the House of Commons, or a desire expressed by the leaders of the Opposition, in regard to such a matter. But, of course, in that case they will understand that they are taking upon themselves the responsibility of delaying the measure. Whether that in itself is a serious matter or not is for them to consider. We press it, not because we have the slightest interest as a Government in pressing it, but because we thought it was our duty to put before the Committee the wishes of the Australian delegates in the matter. Let me say that I should not, perhaps, have made myself the channel for the expression of that wish if I had not been under the impression, which nothing the right hon. Gentleman has said has removed, that it was the general desire of the House to treat this Bill as chiefly an Australian matter. If the House proposes now to adopt a different view with regard to it, why, of course, I admit that the complication of this particular question and the complication of the whole Bill justifies a much longer delay than we have thought of. I was certainly under the impression that, if I could produce to the House *primâ facie* evidence that an arrangement had been arrived at which on its merits we could approve and which had every prospect of commending itself, not merely to a portion of the Australian colonies, but to the Australian colonies as a whole, in that case we should have the assent of the House for taking the present step. I have to acknowledge the spirit in which the matter has been dealt with by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dumfries, but still I do venture to differ from him, because he expressed a desire that even at this late stage we should accept the original Bill as presented to us by Australia.

Sir R. T. REID: If you cannot get an agreement out of them.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I hope we have got an agreement otherwise. But he will permit me to say that in my judgment if we were now to go back to the original Bill it would be the most unsatisfactory course that we could possibly take, that it would be the course which would meet with the most resistance in Australia. I think the House will easily see that a matter which even in our short discussions has proved to be highly technical is not one which can be considered to have been before the minds of all the Australian people when they passed the referendum on the principle of the Bill. Now that it has been discussed, it must be evident to every one that there is a very large and growing opinion in favour of retaining an unrestricted right of appeal. I own that my conviction has always been that the Australian people never intended the Bill to be taken or left by this House, to be swallowed whole or to be rejected, and that there was no alternative for our consideration. On the contrary, everything that I have heard leads me to believe that it was supposed we would give our best consideration to the Bill, and that if we found in it anything that we thought to be of sufficient importance to merit reconsideration we should not hesitate to put our views before the Australian people; and, as far as I can gather, I believe our efforts in that direction have been thoroughly appreciated. The hon. and learned Gentleman said something about the possibility of exciting displeasure. I have not seen a trace of displeasure. On the contrary, there is a thorough appreciation of the spirit in which we have hitherto dealt with the matter. Our main object has been so to pass this Bill finally as to secure the practically unanimous assent of the Australian Parliaments. The recent alterations, and, as I have said, the first alteration that was proposed, gave us all that we thought it necessary to insist upon. These subsequent alterations are suggestions that have come to us from Australia, and I am not at all ashamed of proposing them again and again. I am not at all touched by the irony of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. He talked about a fourth proposal in a few weeks, and said there may be a fifth. [MR. ASQUITH dissented.] Well, he commented upon it in what I understood was a spirit of deprecation.

MR. ASQUITH: Only as an argument for deliberation.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not deny the possibility, and I shall not be in the least ashamed of coming again with a fifth or a sixth suggestion if it is made to me from Australia. If I have reason to believe that other alterations will still further recommend this Bill as a whole to the Australian people, it will be my duty to submit them, even one after another, to the House. As regards time for deliberation, I hope hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite will see fit to hasten proceedings by allowing this stage, at all events, to pass practically unquestioned. We shall be prepared to allow time for further deliberation on the Report stage, which we will postpone to a date which will be convenient to gentlemen opposite. The proposal to extend the powers of the Federal Parliament made by the hon. Member for the Oxford University is one with which I entirely agree. The Federal Parliament under the Constitution will have power to legislate for limiting the right of appeal, although any legislation of the kind will have to be reserved for Her Majesty's pleasure. My hon. friend says we might still further enlarge the legislative capacity of the Federal Parliament by allowing them to extend the right of appeal as well as to limit it. Upon that point, as I have said, I agree with him; but at the same time I should not like to introduce the alteration at this stage, or without knowing whether such an increase of legislative power would be likely to be in consonance with the wishes of the Australian Governments and people. But I will take care, as far as I can, to make myself acquainted with the views of the delegates, at all events, on the subject, and if I should find they have no objection I should be very glad to introduce the change on the Report stage. I think there is only one other word I need say. I disagree from the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries, and still more from the hon. and learned Member for Haddingtonshire, as to the view they take of the respective effects of the original Bill and of the Bill as it will stand when we have amended it. The hon. and learned Member for Haddingtonshire actually puts forward the view that our Amendment restricts the right of appeal more than the original Bill. He says that upon a hasty review of the clause as now presented. Let me point out that the whole of his argument applies to the previous proposed Amendment as well as to the Amendment on the Blue Paper, and, although it has been before the people of Australia for the last three months, not a single word was heard from anyone to justify that view. The hon. and learned Gentleman, as far as I know, stands absolutely and entirely alone. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries did not go so far, but he did consider that the original Bill made a slight limitation and restriction of the right of appeal. That is absolutely contrary to the view taken unanimously by the leading judicial authorities in Australia. Whether it is right or not to make the alteration is another matter. When I am told that the Amendments which we have now made do not affect that restriction, I think I can best answer that by saying that by those Amendments we have placed the question of appeal, with one exception, in precisely the same condition in Australia as it is in Canada. The hon. and learned Gentleman approves of the condition of things with regard to appeal in Canada. Let me point out that under the new Amendments we shall be acting in precisely the same way in Australia as in Canada, except that in the limited number of cases where constitutional questions are tried in the High Court leave to appeal will be given in the case of Australia by the High Court, whereas in the case of Canada leave to appeal is given by the Privy Council. That is the only difference. Having brought the right of appeal in Australia so completely or nearly in accord with the right of appeal in Canada, I think we have secured a very great result, and I am only glad to find that in doing so we have the support apparently of the Australian people.

MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): I do not think my right hon. friend has treated the House with any discourtesy, but he had a matter of the most difficult character to deal with. Nor do I think the House of Commons is at all discredited by the way in which this business has been conducted. I think that in this matter we should defer entirely to Australian opinion in all matters which do not touch the interests of the Empire at large. But I urge my right hon. friend to consider whether it would not be better to assent to report progress at this stage, so that we may have some time to consider the exact meaning of this Amendment which we have seen to-day for the first time.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I wish to say a few words, not on the main question of the merits of the proposed clause, but on another point. The right hon. Gentleman has expressed a very strong opinion to the Committee. He has said that the Government will postpone for a short time further the consideration of the Bill at this stage, if the Committee desire; but he has referred to some evils—unknown evils to us—that would arise, and has implied that it would be a great disappointment and calamity if some short prorogation were allowed. I do not understand what the meaning of that may be. I remember it was on the 14th May that the Bill was read a second time, and the stage which really became the critical stage—for there was no opposition at the Second Reading—was postponed for some time. Considerable surprise was felt at the length of the interval which the right hon. Gentleman allowed, because there was nothing in the merits of the case, in the facts themselves, which made so long an interval necessary. But now, on the morning of our consenting to consider the Bill, we have this new clause put before us, and we are told that it is the result of an agreement between the right hon. Gentleman and the delegates, but neither the delegates nor the Minister know what the feeling of Australia is and what the opinion of the Australian Governments is. That is *prima facie* a very strong case for postponing the consideration of the clause. The right hon. Gentleman adopts a tone which is, I think, entirely satisfactory to the House, when he says that, subject of course to a due regard for our interests, his great desire is to do whatever the Australian people wish—that he will change this clause again and again if he finds that it will so better suit the wishes of the Australian people. That we understand and appreciate, but that is another reason for delay. We do not know what the feeling of the Australian people is. The whole of the arguments appear to me to be in favour of some further delay—a short delay it may be—not only for our convenience, that we may prepare speeches and elaborate arguments, and for the dignity and propriety of the proceedings of this House, but for the sake of our making a good job of this matter when we undertake it. If we claim to be desirous of doing what the Australian people wish, we ought, first of all, to know what they desire. For all these reasons a short delay would not appear to be out of the question, and I am rather surprised that the Government have not themselves proposed it. On the other hand, the right hon. Gentleman was almost severe in his declaration of the great gravity and responsibility which would rest upon us if we invited this delay, and consequently I hesitate to put what is my strong opinion into the form of an actual request.

*MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I certainly do not desire to say a word in disparagement of the skill and patience shown by the right hon. Gentleman in managing the delicate negotiations in reference to this Bill, but I think the whole drift of the debate to-night has been in favour of delay, and there does not seem to be very much weight in the arguments used by the right hon. Gentleman against delay. The right hon. Gentleman has said he wanted to do all he could to meet the wishes of the Australian delegates. But what difference would a short delay make, seeing that it is in order to ascertain the opinion of those speaking for Australia? I am quite sure that after such a delay the debate on the Bill could be concluded in half an hour. Everybody in England is only too anxious that this Bill should be passed and to do anything to promote the happiness and prosperity of the people in Australia. When it was first brought forward it was with every prospect of it being passed, and, considering the splendid spirit shown by the colonists in South Africa, the people in this country should have been only too ready to show their appreciation. The Australian delegates came over boasting, as they had a right to boast, that they were the representatives of the people and Parliaments of Australia—of all the constituted authorities of Australia. Every one of them agreed as to the Bill that it ought to be passed by the House. The Colonial Secretary took up a position of complete antagonism to the measure. It was a matter for regret that the Colonial Secretary, instead of accepting the opinions of the constituted authorities of Australia, had endeavoured to obtain an opinion in Australia in favour of himself. He had adopted all the arts peculiar to the political agitator. We were told that this was the one last link in the Imperial union of the whole Empire—that it was the first step towards Imperial Federation. Anyone who had given any serious thought to the question of Imperial federation among the scattered members of the Empire of Great Britain must know that it is a perfect chimera, and that there is no colony in the Empire which to-morrow would accept the authority of any federated Assembly sitting in London to impose on them any control or any taxation whatever. The great aim of the people of Australia has been to break away from the last vestige and relic of the ill-omened domination of Downing Street in our Colonial Empire.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. Member that the discussion is limited to the Amendment before the Committee.

*MR. MACLEAN: Perhaps I may be permitted to point out why the Australian delegates protested against the scheme of Her Majesty's Government, however it might be modified. It was that they did not think it was one suited to the genius of the Australian people, and they used those eloquent and manly words which I think are strictly appropriate—

> "The delegates reflect with pride that there are sentiments which will constitute eternal 'links of empire,' but are quite unable to understand how there can ever be the least hope that we can merely by insuring uniform interpretation of the law throughout the Empire, facilitate that unity of action for the common interests which will lead to a real federation of the Empire. The 'unity of action' and the uniform 'interpretation of the law' seem to them wholly unrelated and certain to remain so. The consciousness of kinship, the consciousness of common blood, and a consciousness of duty, the pride of their race and history, these are the links of empire, bonds which attach, not bonds which chafe."

These are the sentiments which have inspired the people of Australia, and I think we may rely more upon them, and feel that in the moment of emergency or danger the Australians will come to our side animated by the common sentiments of race, religion and language, by common sympathies, and by common traditions.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I should not oppose a motion for the adjournment proposed from the opposite side with the authority of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. I confess that, although he does not venture to make the request, I have a difficulty in distinguishing between a formal request and the language in which he conveyed his opinion on the matter.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I was frightened out of it by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I was not aware I was so terrible in your opinion. I understand it is the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman that we should not proceed further, although I very much regret that it should be his opinion. I do not feel justified in offering any opposition to reporting progress, and in that case I would suggest that we continue the discussion on Thursday next.

Committee report Progress, to sit again upon Thursday.

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order for Third Reading Read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Sir CHARLES CAMERON (Glasgow, Bridgeton), who was very indistinctly heard in the Reporters' Gallery, was understood to explain that the object of the motion standing on the Paper in his name was to remove a very great defect in the Bill, and to make the measure a real and substantial advance in regard to the remedying of a grievance which had been recognised in the assessment of ecclesiastical buildings in Scotland. During the discussion at the Second Reading stage it was shown that the Bill was as badly drafted as could possibly be conceived, but the measure was read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee. That Standing Committee sat for only a single day, and was very sparsely attended. Although the Bill required certain amendments in matters of detail in order to explain what it really meant, and although various Amendments were moved by supporters of the Government with the object of making the measure more clear, the Lord Advocate, acting upon a very obvious system of Parliamentary tactics, refused to amend a single word of the Bill, the measure being reported without amendment to the House, thus escaping a discussion on Report. The hon. Member disclaimed any attempt to recommit the Bill for the purpose of making minor or verbal Amendments, but he desired its recommittal for the insertion of an Amendment which would have the effect of making the new power proposed in the Bill a reality instead of a sham. He was not alone in this desire, as no fewer than four Members of the Standing Committee, three of whom were supporters of the Government, had Amendments to the same effect before the Committee, but on a division were defeated, although of the Scotch Members present there were a majority in favour of the alteration. The clause he desired to have inserted was really the handiwork of the hon. Member for Glasgow University, who brought this Bill in many years ago as embodying the wish of the Church of Scotland in the matter, and the Bill then contained this very clause word for word. He therefore hoped to have the hon. Member's support to the proposal that the Bill be recommitted in respect of a new clause, which motion he now begged to move.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I rise for the purpose of seconding the motion. Although I am one of those who vote in favour of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of Scotland, yet I am one of those who are always prepared favourably to consider any proposal for the removal of any real grievance of the Church so long as that State connection exists. With regard to this Bill, I am surprised that the Church has brought in a Bill which introduces a principle entirely antagonistic to the principle of justice for which the Church has all along contended. In the first place, it has been strongly objected to that the feuars should be called upon to pay any part whatever of the expense of providing church accommodation and of the manse for the clergyman. I cannot conceive any reason of principle why these feuars of £50 a year should be exempted from the obligation attaching to the land of paying their proportion for the church accommodation in the parish. The parish church has to be erected for the accommodation of the parishioners whoever they may be, and if the population increases owing to the building of parishioners in the parish the parish church has to be correspondingly enlarged. The parish churches in Scotland have to be made sufficient in size to accommodate the parishioners without regard to dissent in the parish. Therefore, when you are dealing with the building of a parish church, you are dealing with a church which the law prescribes should be built in every parish for the accommodation of every parishioner in that parish. Obviously, therefore, what can be more just and reasonable, when the population of a parish increases, than that those persons for whose benefit public accommodation is required to be provided should bear their proportionate share of the cost of providing that accommodation? It is no argument to say that the feuars do not use the accommodation. If a public park is provided, it is no answer to say, "I do not go to the public park, and therefore should not be assessed." The park is provided for you whether you use it or not. In the same way, the parish church, be it right or be it wrong, is provided for you whether you go or not. This burden is one of the obligations on the land, and it is a just burden so long as we recognise the present system of State establishment and the obligation of the State to provide accommodation in the parish church whether the parishioners attend or not. That being so, why is this Bill brought in? It is not because the present law is unjust in principle. The law is perfectly just in principle, assuming the State connection to exist. The Bill is brought in because a great grievance has been alleged on the part of dissenters. They say, "We are providing church accommodation for ourselves, and why should we have to help provide for the parish church?" The same answer could be made by a man who sends his children to a private school. Why should he pay rates for the public schools? The reply to that argument is simply "There is the church and there is the accommodation provided for you. If you do not make use of that accommodation, or if you provide for private worship for yourselves, that is a matter for your own concern." The moment you deviate from that principle you get into difficulty so far as the Church is concerned. If it is not just that the dissenter should provide his fair share of the accommodation in the parish church, it is equally not just that he should have to pay any part of the minister's stipend in respect of the public worship in that church. Once you deviate from a principle of this kind you cannot stop. The Government have always maintained the justice of the principle of this assessment, and until you are able to deal with the subject comprehensively, and abolish the rate altogether, levying the burden of providing parish church accommodation in some other way, it would be much better to leave the incidence of taxation as it stands at present. What is the principle here as regards the first clause of the Bill? As the law stands at present the valuation is made upon the real rent. But there is an old valuation which has been in operation in some parishes which the House of Lords has decided not to be legally enforcible. According to a decision of the House of Lords about eighty years ago, the assessment must be based upon the real rent of the parish. The result is that every man will pay according to the valuation of his house, according to whatever is his value in the parish. That is the present law. At one time there was an old valuation in the parish; that is to say, 200 or 300 years ago the proprietor of land in a parish got his valuation fixed. But obviously such a valuation has no relation to the existing value of his land. Suppose since then minerals have been found in the land. A man who stands perhaps at a valuation of £300 a year may at present be drawing a revenue of £60,000 a year from that land, and yet be assessed at only the valued rent as it was made 200 or 300 years ago, and which has no relation whatever to the existing value. The result of this proposal will be that the men with the large incomes in the parish will be paying very small sums. That will be the effect of this provision in many parishes. No hon. Member would dare to propose in this House to make the old valuation compulsory. I do not believe the Lord Advocate would bring in such a measure, and if he did I do not think a single hon. Member on the opposite side would support him. This Parliament would never declare that it would take as the basis of an assessment the valuation fixed 200 or 300 years ago. The proposal of this Bill is that two-thirds in value may impose upon the other one-third this most unjust valuation. It is unjust that any majority should have it in their power to enforce upon a minority a system of valuation which neither this House nor any Parliament in the world would ever think of imposing. In every instance where you attempt to carry out this clause you will be creating an absolute injustice, because you are giving a majority the power to do that which this House would not itself authorise to be done. With regard to the rent, a statement is to be made about the amount that has to be paid, and the man who is exempted according to this section is not to be allowed to vote in any proceedings connected with the Church. How will you be in a position to ascertain the cost until you have had a meeting to vote upon the plans? This is where the Amendment comes in with great force. The men may be disfranchised at the last moment, but in the meantime how are you to know whether they will be contributors or not unless you have some obligation and guarantee that the money is to be forthcoming? You cannot exclude men from any participation in the voting on the plans, when it will not be known until the very end whether the Kirk

Session is to pay this money or not. Look at the position the Church would be placed in. If you have one parish where the money is not contributed by a Kirk Session, there you have a distinct grievance which would be felt as a statutory grievance, because although it is optional for the Kirk Session in the Bill to subscribe the money, yet it is a fair indication of the mind of Parliament that it is the duty of the Kirk Session to find the money, and if one Session does not find the money you create the grounds for an uproar in that parish. Is it not in the interests of the Church, if we are to acknowledge the principle of the Kirk Session contributing any share, that it should be fixed definitely, so that the money provided under the clause in every parish will be put on the same footing, and the possibility will not arise in future of one parish having a Kirk Session which pays, and another which does not pay, with the result that this grievance is ten times worse than under the existing state of the law? The amount is said to be £50. What reason is there for drawing the line at £50, and why should it not be £60 or £100? It is also provided that there shall be no assessment upon the buildings of any religious body. That system has gone on for many years, and there is a good deal of reason for maintaining it. If you have a church belonging to a dissenting body it can be sold to-morrow. The burden is attached to that church of paying its share for the taxation of the parish, and there is nothing wrong in principle in a matter of that kind. But it is different when dealing with the case of the parish church itself, because that church is in the same position as the poor-house. You do not assess the poor-house for Poor Law purposes, because it is the institution which is being supported. You do not charge the paupers with poor rates because they are paupers, and a parish church is in quite a different position from the dissenting church, because it is the object and not the subject of taxation. In the case of dissenting churches it is private property, which may increase in value and which may be sold. On the question of principle I do not see any reason for this exemption. I admit it is done for the purpose of endeavouring to remove a grievance, but when you deviate from a principle in removing a grievance you will find that you land yourself into worse confusion. The moment you deviate from the principle you are carried away to any extent, and I think it is a pity that the Church, if they intend to deal with this question, should not have dealt with it in the more modified degree mentioned by my hon. friend, and which is the object of this Amendment. The payment of this money should be made compulsory on the part of the Kirk Session. If you did that you would have a good reason for excluding people from participation in the voting. I do not see how it is possible without this new clause to go on excluding in this way. I think the Church, in its own interest, has not been well advised in raising this question in this perfunctory manner. The dissenting churches of Scotland not only provide their own churches and manses, but they provide about £1,500,000 a year for their religious teachings. When you consider that the Church of Scotland, which claims to contain the wealthiest portion of the community, only contributes £500,000 a year for all purposes, and when it is borne in mind that the Church of Scotland gets its ministers' stipends paid for out of the teinds, surely it is not too much to say that they should also pay to provide comfortable habitations in which to go to worship. If the principle is just that these small heritors should pay, it ought to be made compulsory, and if it is not just they should be excluded. I beg to second my hon. friend's proposition.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'now read the third time,' and add the words 're-committed in respect of a New Clause'"—(*Sir Charles Cameron*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'now read the third time' stand part of the Question."

*MR. J. A. CAMPBELL (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities): I think the hon. Member for Mid Lanarkshire has gone very wide afield in seconding this motion. He has conjured up a very formidable list of dangers and difficulties that will happen if this Bill is passed. They are mostly imaginary, and in so far as they are not imaginary I do not think it is beyond the wit of man to find some way of avoiding them. I may remark, however, that there was much in what the hon. Member said about the question of assessments which I would commend to the notice of my hon. friend whose motion he seconded. With regard to the motion of the hon. Member for Bridgeton, the hon. Member claims my support because he says the same clause was contained in a Bill in 1884, which I had the honour of introducing. I am not ashamed of that clause in its original position. I think it was a good clause in the Bill of 1884. But we are now no longer concerned with that Bill, for we have another Bill before us which contains a provision which makes the clause unnecessary. The object of the clause was to give security that the promoters of the work for which an assessment was to be imposed would produce funds to replace the sums lost to the assessment by the exemptions or deductions due to the operation of the Bill. The Bill made certain exemptions or deductions from assessment in favour of certain heritors, called feuars. In order that no additional burden be thereby imposed on the other heritors the deficiency in the product of the assessment caused by these exemptions must be found otherwise, and the clause proposed that a bond of security should be given by persons of satisfactory standing that this money should be forthcoming. That is the clause which my hon. friend proposes to add to this Bill. It was necessary in the Bill of 1884, but the present Bill provides that the money must have been actually raised and paid by the Kirk Session to the collector of the assessment. In other words, instead of asking for security, it requires a cash payment. There is therefore no longer any need for the clause. The question has been asked, why continue the burden upon land of maintaining the church and manse buildings? The question should rather be, why should land be relieved of this burden? Estates in Scotland for generations past have been subject to it, have changed hands under it, and have come into the possession of the present owners with this burden upon them. Purchasers have paid so much the less for their estates because of this burden. I would ask our friends on the Opposition side do they propose to make the landlords of Scotland a present of £42,000 a year? That is the sum which the burden was found to amount to, some years ago. The heritors of Scotland as a body do not complain of the burden, and never have done so. It is only a section of their number, the small feuars, who have complained. Their position is somewhat peculiar. They hold that for many years it was not understood that they were liable to any share of this burden. For fifty years after the law was declared it never was put in force, because there was no valuation roll to enable the assessors to get at the value of the feuars' properties, and when the Valuation Act was passed in 1854 and it was made possible to reach the feuars, they not unnaturally felt that they had a certain grievance when an assessment of this kind was levied upon them. The Church now wishes to relieve the small feuars, but in such a way as not to impose any additional burden upon the other heritors. Such is the reason for this Bill. The Bill is applicable to the original parishes only—some 900 out of 1,350. As regards parishes with a large urban element, in which any assessment if imposed would be on the real rent, and in which the number of heritors, including feuars, would be very great, I believe the practice, when outlay on church building is required, will increasingly be to have no assessment whatever, but to raise the money wholly by voluntary subscription—as has recently been done in the instances of St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh; Barony, Glasgow; and Abbey, Paisley. But that is not inconsistent with retaining the obligation of heritors for such assessments. Even when the money is raised by subscription individual heritors are found as a rule to contribute willingly, recognising their obligation as heritors although it is not enforced by an assessment. But cases will occur when recourse to assessment is necessary, and this Bill will make it possible to carry it out without such friction as has been caused in too many instances in the past.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 145; Noes, 55. (Division List No. 147.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George

Bartley, George C. T.
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Blakiston-Houston, John
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Charrington, Spencer
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt Hon Sir William Hart
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Fry, Lewis
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. V. (St. Albans)
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G J (St. George's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jessel, Captain H. Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Kimber, Henry
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning- (Corn
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Swans.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lopes, H. Yarde Buller
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Peel, Hon. W. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. Curzon
Pollock, Harry Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, William (Derbysh.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams, Joseph Powell- (Birm.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn E. R. (Bath)
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Commander (Berks, E.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

AYES.

Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Right Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir Wm. Brampton
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea
Labouchere, Henry
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington
M'Crae, George
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, W. Pritchard (Merthy
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Oldroyd, Mark
Price, Robert John
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Smith, James Parker (Lanar
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Steadman, William Charles
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Webberburn, Sir William
Whiteley, George (Stockport)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Frederick W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Charles Cameron and
Mr. Caldwell.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. BIRRELL (Fifeshire, W.): I condole with the Lord Advocate, who is a man of virile intelligence, on having to take charge and pass through the House this measure, which even those who sit behind him regard as the smallest bantling ever introduced into this House even by a Minister of the Crown. It is the smallest and most pedantic measure ever seen, a microscopic measure of the poorest description. You might describe it in Shakespearean language as "the baby of a girl." The hon. Gentleman referred to the fact that from time immemorial there has been this charge upon the land of Scotland, and it is news to me to be told that any Scotchman who has acquired a portion of soil of his country should wish to be relieved of the burden of the maintenance of the fabrics of the Established Church, except, indeed, upon fair terms—namely, that the burden should be put upon the shoulders of those who derive advantage from them. That is a fair and reasonable solution, but why the existing state of things should be altered as it is to be altered by this Bill, simply because a number of feuars hold a small portion of soil, I am at a loss to understand. We are told there is a grievance, but it is not a grievance which has ever pressed itself upon my attention, at any rate. When I was in Scotland I never heard that the small feuars of the county of Fife had a burden more unbearable than that of anyone else as to the payments of local charges. It is not a thing to be disclaimed, and the small feuar should not be allowed in this House to disclaim it. It was on account of the existence of this charge that he obtained his land cheaper than he otherwise would. No doubt there is some misapprehension on this question in Scotland; the small feuar thought he was absolved from this burden, but it is now a long time since the obscure part of the law was made clear. The small feuar and the large landowner are both charged, but the way in which this Bill deals with the charge is highly characteristic of modern legislation. The small feuar is to be absolved from this burden on terms; that is to say, if the Kirk Session, by means of a bazaar or charitable contributions, is able to make good the deficiency, this Bill is to come into operation; but, unless the funds are forthcoming, the obligation remains. I think it is the first time in the history of Parliament that a person has been relieved of a burden in such a manner. This Bill is a very contemptible measure, and I think it is only fair to draw attention to this fact, that the small feuar is to be relieved of a burden which has been borne from time immemorial, if any persons in Scotland—good, bad, or indifferent—are prepared to make good the deficiency out of their own pockets. I see no reason why the land should be relieved from a burden which it took in exchange for something very valuable. It has got off uncommonly easily from its other obligations, with regard particularly to education. However that may be, from time immemorial the land in Scotland has borne this burden, and if the question is to be dealt with at all it should be dealt with on a bolder and more honourable principle.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I think the hon. Member for West Fife has scarcely appreciated the object of this Bill, and his comments have been characterised by the same fault which ran through the speech of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark, who dealt with the technical points of the measure. The hon. Member for Mid Lanark complained, as the hon. Member who has just sat down complained, that feuars should be exempted from a burden which now falls upon them, and which has always been on the land in Scotland. But the hon. Members seem to forget that this burden did not always press upon the feuars, because they are a newly created class. It is really out of the question to say, as the hon. Member for Mid Lanark says, that every feuar has a right to a seat in the parish church. That is a legal fiction. St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, is a good illustration. Why, if the hon. Gentleman's argument were enforced the Waverley Market would not be nearly big enough. If the hon. Member for Mid Lanark had devoted his gifts to the ministry and had been minister of the church of St. Cuthbert's the ears of the greedy parishioners would have been open in vain to the voice of my hon. friend. The hon. Member went on to say that he objected to the clause in the Bill which exempts the churches of other denominations, and he asked why they should not pay. "Why do you not," he asked, "charge poor rates on paupers?" "Because," he said, "paupers are the objects and not the subjects of the poor rates." When he said that I could not but remember a proverb with which, no doubt, he is familiar. "You can't take the breeks off a Highlandman," because he does not happen to possess them. That is why you do not levy poor rates on paupers. This Bill is not meant to do any more than permissibly allow the people to obviate a grievance which practically creates friction. The hon. Member for West Fife says it has never been brought to his notice that the feuars there object to bearing their burden. There is a simple reason for that. In the Division of West Fife, which he represents, the parishes are almost entirely and purely landward, and of course it is not in such places that opposition can emerge. It is in parishes which are not purely landward, parishes which are partly landward and partly burghal, and where there are large populous places, that the real difficulty arises. I hope the House will give this measure a Third Reading. I am content to allow the people of Scotland to decide as to whether the epithets of the Member for West Fife are deserved. We can well afford to wait for the measures he will introduce when he gets a well-deserved seat on this bench. But this Bill will as a matter of fact remove what has been an unfortunate cause of friction in the past, and stimulate the Church to greater activity in Scotland.

*MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): I stand before the House as a valued heritor threatened with ecclesiastical assessment for the building of a new church. I want to remove this controversy from the air of abstraction hitherto attending it, and to present to the House the spectacle of my own grievance, if it is possible to get the House to listen. I am sure I shall succeed when I relate my tale. I live, in those times of the year when I am not compulsorily drawn to attend the sittings of this House, near a town where there is a parish church which for years has amply satisfied all my spiritual requirements. We have recently called a new minister. Little did we know what that would entail upon us. He says the sitting room is insufficient and that the fabric must be repaired. Under the law of Scotland as it stands at the present time he is in a position to call upon the heritors, and not only the valued heritors, to deal with the case. In that town there are a large number of people called feuars. The feuars of Auchterarder are a robust body. Their ancestors were out in the '45, and shed their blood in those days. Later on they brought about the Disruption. As they attend the parish church much more frequently than it is possible for me to do, they are naturally the persons who, under a reasonable construction of the law, should meet this assessment. But how will things stand if this Bill passes? Why, the heritors will be the persons who will be primarily liable to the incidence of this tax, because if the Bill means anything it means that some relief is to be given to the feuars. The feuars of Auchterarder are not people who are excessively attached to the doctrines and associations of the present Government. They have, some of them, been very much opposed to the Established Church since the Disruption, and, as far as I can conceive the motive and purpose with which this Bill is introduced, it is merely to reconcile the feuars of Auchterarder and many similar places to a continuance of the principle of Establishment. What is this Bill brought in for? To remedy any grievance? No. It is like a number of other Bills brought before the House by the Government to redeem pledges given by private Members. For another example, there is the extension of the Compensation Act to farm servants. Without any manifestation of a desire that they should bring in this ecclesiastical assessments measure the Government at the last moment, when it is comparatively far on in its life, brings it in, I presume, with the object of being able to say to the people of Scotland that they have done something substantial for the Establishment. I am advised by experts on the spot that if this Bill passes it will not have the slightest effect on the minds of the people of Auchterarder. There is not the smallest probability that any contribution will be got out of the valued-rent heritors which they are not required to pay at the present time. I am glad to see from the first clause of the Bill that it cannot come into operation except with the consent of a two-thirds majority in value. The clause states that—

"It shall be lawful for any valued-rent heritor to request the clerk to the heritors to summon a meeting of valued-rent heritors in the manner prescribed by Section 22 of the Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland) Act; and if at such meeting it is resolved by a majority of not less than two-thirds in value of valued-rent heritors, voting personally or by proxy, that the amount shall be imposed according to valued rent, then such assessment shall be imposed according to the valued rent, any law to the contrary notwithstanding."

That gives me some confidence that the Government does not really mean that this is a serious measure. Why should hon. Members opposite in this House who have no interest in Scotch ecclesiastical matters be tormented with a Bill which can effect no practical change in the position as it is at the present moment?

*SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): The hon. and learned Member for Haddington says that there is no possible grievance to be remedied. I utterly deny that proposition. In the year 1887 I had the honour to back a Bill brought in by my right hon. friend the Member for Edinburgh University, and I myself brought in a Bill in a subsequent year, very much of the same character as this one. A question very commonly asked at the last General Election was "Why cannot you do something in the direction of relieving the feuars of this burden?" It has been invariably the Liberal party who has opposed this kind of legislation, while the Conservatives have always been quite willing to remedy the present state of things. The hon. and learned Member for West Fife says that this is a microscopic Bill to deal with a microscopic grievance. It may be a small Bill and a small grievance, but there is such a thing as a sentimental grievance which is more hardly felt than a real big one. I have never been personally annoyed as a valued-rent heritor by the payment of the rate on valued rent, and I believe that most of the valued-rent heritors are willing and ready to pay their full quota of the rates. I heartily thank the Government for bringing in this Bill, and I hope it will be passed to-night.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 154; Noes, 61. (Division List No. 148.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hon J A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worcester
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasg'w)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Fry, Lewis
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (Cy. of Lond.)
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt. Hn. G. J. (St. Geor.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. Wm.
Kimber, Henry
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning- (Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Swnsea
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh.)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Hbt. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. Horace C.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Rutherford, John
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, Wm. (Derbysh.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Strauss, Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col Sir C E H (Sheffield)
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Asher, Alexander
Billson, Alfred
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Charles (Glasgow)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Fenwick, Charles
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Crae, George
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, W. P. (Merthyr)
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Oldroyd, Mark
Price, Robert John
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Steadman, William Charles
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. Carvell (Notts.)
Wilson, Frederick W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Haldane and Mr. Birrell.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

LAND CHARGES BILL [Lords].

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), be now considered."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said that this was a Bill of a most complicated character, relating entirely to England. It was to be regretted that the Government had not, when introducing a measure of this kind, availed themselves of the opportunity of practically consolidating the whole law on the subject. That could have been done in a very simple manner. As the Bill stood at the present moment it was impossible to consider the effect of it without going consecutively through the whole of the statutes from the Judgments Act of 1838, which were more or less repealed by the Schedule. So far as the operative effect of a judgment as a charge upon land was concerned, that was contained in Section 13 of the Act of 1838, but that section had no relation to the law as it at present stood. All that was necessary to simplify the law was to recast practically the sections of the Act of 1838 which were still operative, and adapt them to the existing state of the law. If that had been done and another clause added dealing with *lites pendens*, they would have had the whole of the law relating to judgments as charges on land in one Bill. As it was the matter was left in so complicated a state that it would be very difficult indeed for any ordinary practitioner to know what the law really was. Then, the law was not to come into operation for a year, which would prevent consolidation for some time. He hoped that some attempt would be made, at no distant date, to consolidate the law and put it into a simpler form.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. CALDWELL, in moving the Amendment standing in his name, said it was stated that the business of the Registrar of Judgments was to be transferred to the Land Registry, and power was given to the Lord Chancellor, by order, to arrange for the abolition of the office of Registrar of Judgments. It did seem strange to provide for the transfer of an office and then for its abolition. It seemed to him that there was no very clear reason for abolishing the office, for it would have to remain for certain purposes connected with the registration of *lites pendens.* Again, the Bill was not to affect the Register of Scotch and Irish judgments. He merely formally moved his Amendment to enable the Attorney General to give an expression of opinion on the subject.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out from the word 'transfer,' to the end of Sub-section 1, of Clause 1."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) desired to acknowledge the spirit which the hon. Member had shown on this subject, in which he had taken a great interest, and in connection with which he had had the opportunity of conferring with him. He hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment. The office itself was not to be transferred to the Land Registry, but the business of the office. The registration of *lites pendens* would also go to the Land Registry, subject to the rules in the Statute Book. The abolition of the office of the Registrar of Judgments would in no way affect the registration of Scotch or Irish judgments. As to the abolition of the office, if the Lord Chancellor found that it was necessary that the office should still continue to exist, the power of abolition placed in his hands would not be exercised without careful consideration.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I hope the House will now assent to the Third Reading of the Bill.

MR. CALDWELL: I do not object to the Third Reading being now taken, but I hope the Attorney General will give us some information on the subject of consolidation.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I am sure the House will realise that there are many difficulties connected with the question of consolidation, but I hope in a subsequent session to have the assistance of the hon. Gentleman in endeavouring to pass a measure of that kind.

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

BURIAL GROUNDS BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): The Amendment which I now move was moved in the Standing Committee on Law, and was opposed by the Home Secretary, not because it was objectionable in itself, but because it was unnecessary. The right hon. Gentleman must, however, have been unaware, or forgetful, of certain facts which would have modified his views, and I therefore wish to submit those facts to the House. I have also a further object in view in moving this Amendment, and that is to elicit from the right hon. Gentleman in this House an important statement he made in the Standing Committee in regard to one aspect of this Bill. This Amendment relates to the allotment of ground to religious denominations in public cemeteries, and it is necessary to inform the House how this system has originated and how it has been worked. One of the Burial Acts provides that every burial ground shall be divided into consecrated and unconsecrated parts, and that the unconsecrated part shall be allotted in such a manner and in such portions as may be sanctioned by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. When a witness from the Home Office appeared before the Standing Committee he was questioned upon this subject, and what was his admission? That the section to which I have just referred does not in any way explain what allotments are referred to, and that it was only "a sort of guess one had to make" that it was intended to be allotments to different sects. Yet on the strength of a mere guess the Home Office has created a system of denominational allotment, and has determined the mode in which that system must be administered. Up to 1897 allotments had been made in eighty-nine cemeteries and in all but nine to Roman Catholics, in other cases to "Roman Catholics or strangers," and in only one case to Jews. While it is admitted on the part of the Home Office that there is no decision on the point, it is the Home Office view that those to whom the allotments have been made have exclusive and absolute control over them. There has been a great deal of difficulty in certain cases. In the case of King's Lynn, a cemetery was provided by the town council many years ago and a small portion was allotted to the use of Roman Catholics, but nothing was said about its exclusive use by members of that body. For several years no difficulty arose, but in 1892 it was desired to bury in a family grave in the Roman Catholic portion one who had been a Roman Catholic, but who had become a Protestant. It was desired that the deceased should be buried by the Baptist minister, and the desire was fulfilled. The Roman Catholic authorities complained of the invasion of their rights, and very unseemly scenes followed. The town council felt that they had no power to prevent the Baptist minister officiating on the occasion. The Home Office was appealed to, and they replied that when once an allotment was made on behalf of any body that portion must be reserved for the exclusive use of that body, and that it was the duty of the burial authority to resist any invasion of that right. Thereupon the Town Council very respectfully expressed dissent from the Home Office view, and asked whether the police were justified in interfering in order to prevent the alleged invasion of rights. At that point the Home Office faltered, and replied that they could not undertake to give advice, but would leave the local authority to act in accordance with their own discretion. Another case subsequently arose in the same cemetery. It was a case of a convert from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism, and the wish of the deceased was to be buried with her children in the family grave. Another case is now pending at Barnstaple. A burial service was performed in the ground allotted to Roman Catholics by a Church of England clergyman; whereupon Father Byrne protested to the burial board, and the board refused to recognise the right, or rather the exclusive right, of Roman Catholics in the ground. The Roman Catholics appealed to the Home Secretary, and a reply has been received that in the opinion of the Home Office no other service can be held on the ground allotted to Roman Catholics, and the burial board has been called upon to comply with the requirements of the law. The argument of the burial board is that this is not a requirement of the law, but simply of the Home Office. There are several objections in my opinion to the entire system of allotments to religious bodies in cemeteries. It seems to me most unreasonable that when all the inhabitants of the parish defrayed the cost—sometimes the very heavy cost—of a public cemetery, one religious denomination should claim to have a sole and exclusive right to use a portion of the ground. Those who wish for separation in burial should, I think, be obliged to make separate provision for themselves. I see no reason whatever why members of the Roman Catholic Church should possess a privilege, or right, which has been distinctly taken away from the members of the Church of England. If that were unreasonable at the outset of this system, since the passing of the Burial Act of 1880 it appears to be absolutely preposterous. That Act affirmed the principle that there should be no distinction between consecrated and unconsecrated ground in either churchyards or cemeteries, but that orderly and Christian services might be performed anywhere, under certain provisions. But this allotment system is practically an invasion of the Act of 1880, because it continues, for the benefit of particular classes of the community, the restrictive rights which were abolished by the legislature. I wish to emphasise the fact that this has been done, not by statutory authority, but has been solely the action of the Home Office. No doubt the Home Office thought they were justified in adopting that course in past times, but now that the Act of 1880 has affected such a great change in our burial system I submit that this system of allotment is quite out of harmony with modern legislation, and that it requires to be regularised, if not abolished. The answer of the Home Office to my contention is that this Amendment is not necessary, and that all that it seeks is provided for by the existing law. My reply is that the action of the Home Office is not compatible with the provisions of this Amendment, which affirms a principle that in my opinion the Home Office has distinctly violated. The practical importance of this question has been very much increased by what transpired in the Standing Committee. Some of the facts which I have described were brought out in evidence, and the question arose as to whether members of the Church of England could not also have the benefit of this allotment system, and on the Home Office witness being asked the question he replied, "In accordance with the strict words of the Act I do not see why not, because the Act is so extremely vague." Then he was asked whether, if allotments were granted to the Church of England it would not be an entire departure from the Act of 1880, and he replied that that was the Home Office view, if an allotment could be given to the Church at all. If the Home Office view were translated into action on the part of many members of the Church of England, it would be a practical abrogation of the Act of 1880, which required years of agitation and bitter feeling to place on the Statute Book. I hope the House will feel that the present state of the law is most unsatisfactory, and that, if the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary does not see his way to abolish this system of allotment, he will strengthen the hands of the local authorities, in order that they may be able to resist the unjust and, as I think, the unfounded claim of religious denominations to whom portions of the cemeteries may have been allotted. The right hon. Gentleman in dealing with this question in the Standing Committee gave the assurance that there was no intention on the part of the Home Office to strain the allotment system, so that portions of cemeteries might be allotted to the exclusive use of the Church of England. That is a very satisfactory explanation so far as it goes. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Home Secretary has not stated a single objection to the Amendment. His sole contention is that it is uncalled for, as the existing law is adequate. I submit that the facts I have stated show that the existing law requires amendment. The purpose to be served by this Amendment cannot be obtained until the law is altered. I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman and the Government are anxious that this should be an efficacious measure and that they would regret if, in consequence of any defects or mistakes, the Bill renewed the strife which prevailed for so many years. If the Amendment be unnecessary, it will be on the showing of the Home Secretary himself harmless. I hope, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman will see his way to remove all apprehension on the point, by consenting to the insertion of these words. I beg to move, Sir.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 11, after the word 'board,' to insert the words, 'Provided that where any portion of a burial ground is allotted under any Act for the use of any particular religious denomination, the freehold of the same shall remain vested in the burial authority, which shall have the same control over burials therein as in other parts of the burial ground, and the provisions of The Burial Laws Amendment Act, 1880, as amended by this Act, shall apply thereto."—(*Mr. Carvell Williams.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): I think that the hon. Gentleman is unnecessarily alarmed both as to what has been the practice of the Home Office which he has so consistently attacked and as to what is the present law. As I said in the Standing Committee, this Amendment may mean something more than appears on the face of it, in which case it would be objectionable. But according to the present interpretation of the law it is unnecessary, because the freehold remains with the burial authorities, and nothing that this Bill does in any way disturbs the right of the burial authority over ground over which their jurisdiction extends, whether it has been allotted or not. The hon. Gentleman seems to think that the Home Office not only at the present time, but for years, has been straining the law. I can only say that everything which has been done by the Home Office has been consistently done, and in the opinion of the Law Officers has been in strict conformity with the statute.

When the hon. Gentleman asks for an assurance that there is no intention to allot to members of the Church of England, which he specially named, I can only say that if any application came from members of the Church of England for the allotment of unconsecrated ground —because by law the ground must be unconsecrated to be allotted—it would be for the Home Office to say whether under the law they must comply with the request or not. But hitherto, as the hon. Gentleman knows, members of the Church of England have desired to conduct their burials in consecrated ground and have never applied for allotments; nor, I am disposed to think, are they likely to apply. The Act of 1880 and its effect on the allotment system appear to be altogether misunderstood by the hon. Gentleman. The Act of 1880 was intended to get over certain ecclesiastical difficulties in consecrated ground, and also with reference to certain cases of church services in unconsecrated ground, and it is in no way affected by this Bill or by the operation of the allotment system. The general objection to the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman is this—I maintain in the first place that it does not alter the law. It may or may not alter the law, but on the face of it—at all events the first part of it—it does not. In the second place, if it does it is in distinct contradiction to the recommendations of the Committee. That Committee was a very valuable one, and did more to settle this very difficult and controversial question about burials than any action which has been taken in the House of Commons for many years, and I should be sorry if a point such as this were now reopened. The question of the allotment system was considered by the Committee, and one of their recommendations was that the system of allotment under the Burials Act should be continued. They obviously did not desire to enlarge upon the question of allotment at all, and I do think that, while I am as anxious as the hon. Gentleman that this Bill should put an end to some of the more difficult and controversial questions, it would be much better—I say it with confidence—to carry out in their entirety the recommendations of the Committee and to leave the allotment system where it is. I hope, therefore, the hon. Gentleman will not press the Amendment.

Sir M. White Ridley.

*SIR F. S. POWELL (Wigan): First of all I must express my great regret that the hon. Gentleman who often claims the dignified position of peacemaker should on this occasion endeavour to foment strife. The proceedings of the Select Committee were conducted from first to last in a spirit of friendship and compromise, and I cannot see in the records of that Committee any motion made by the hon. Gentleman in the sense of his motion this evening. He seems to have been influenced at that time by the spirit of peace and goodwill which prevailed on the Committee, and I regret that a different spirit actuates him to-night. I should not have ventured to take part in this debate if it were not for the circumstance that my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen in Lancashire are greatly affected by these proposals. In Liverpool there is an allotment for Roman Catholics, and the evidence given before the Committee was as follows —

> "A portion of land was set apart for the use of Roman Catholics, so that the members of that body might be interred together, and it is the intention of the local authority to give this exclusively to Roman Catholics."

That privilege has been long enjoyed by Roman Catholics. I believe it is greatly valued by them, and why should it be taken away? In Wigan, the borough I have the honour to represent, the Roman Catholics have had an allotment for forty-five years, and that allotment they have enjoyed in peace and contentment without any disturbance or friction or difficulty. Why does the hon. Gentleman representing the Nonconformists endeavour to interfere with the harmony which has so long prevailed? Not only in Wigan, but in the adjoining townships, the same system exists with the same satisfactory results and the same absence of strife. Am I not justified, therefore, in complaining of the language of the hon. Gentleman? He talks of concord and peace, but his language is not the language of peace, and his words are not the words of concord. I will oppose the Amendment on the ground that it promotes neither peace, concord, nor Christian love.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: I may say I raised the point in Committee, and divided the Committee on it.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): I am surprised at the extraordinary and misleading speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan. He has been attacking an entirely imaginary proposition. My hon. friend the Member for the Mansfield Division of Notts in his Amendment makes no attempt to remove these allotments, and he uttered no word whatever to justify the angry denunciations which I have never heard the hon. Baronet use before in such unmeasured terms. I am entirely at a loss to understand what should have excited him to such an extent. What my hon. friend proposes is that in case of an allotment of this kind the freehold should still remain the property of the burial authority, who should still continue to have some hold over the burial ceremony. If I understood the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary aright, this Amendment would practically not alter the law.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I believe not.

MR. BROADHURST: If that is so I would advise the House to accept the Amendment. The Home Secretary tells us in good faith that he believes it will not alter the law. He is stating what he believes to the best of his knowledge and authority to be true. If that be so the proposition of my hon. friend practically coincides with the existing law, and the denunciation to which we have just listened should have been addressed to the Home Secretary and not to my hon. friend. I hope the hon. Baronet will ask the permission of the House to offer some apology for the attack he has just made on my hon. friend. So far as I am concerned I do not wish to interfere with the sentiment of any religious denomination, either with regard to the burial ceremony or the location of the interment. At the same time I do think that every progressive Christian man must recognise the elementary principle of Christianity which deprecates as far as it can, without causing unnecessary pain, separation after death. It is a lamentable state of things, to my mind, that any one religious section of the community should desire to have a separate allotment for the purposes of interment. I do not see what reasonable justification there is for it. But at the same time my hon. friend does not propose to interfere with it, although he regrets the existence of the sentiment. I thank the Home Secretary for the very nice manner in which he has met my hon. friend. He has made a very important statement, no doubt with full knowledge. I believe he is perfectly correct in stating that the main principle of this Amendment now exists in law, and I will therefore join with the Home Secretary in appealing to my hon. friend not to press his Amendment to division.

*MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): Listening to the impassioned language of the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan, I feel profoundly glad he was not on the Committee which had under consideration this important Bill—as I doubt if we should have arrived at this compromise. The object of the Amendment has been misunderstood by the hon. Baronet. The Member for Mansfield rose in Committee when this question of allotments came up and moved certain modifications, in order to leave himself free to discuss the matter on the Third Reading. It is not open, therefore, for the hon. Member for Wigan to attack my hon. friend as he has done. His object was to obtain the re-assertion of the principle contained in the Amendment—namely—

"that where any portion of a burial ground is allotted under any Act for the use of any particular religious denomination, the freehold of the same shall remain vested in the burial authority."

The Home Secretary has re-asserted that principle, and it was simply because my hon. friend thought it was not asserted sufficiently plainly that he put the Amendment on the Paper. He would have preferred if the Home Secretary had stated in the House as plainly as he stated in the Grand Committee his views in regard to allotments and the Church of England. He asserted that the Home Office did not wish to encourage the use of the allotments by the Church of England, nor to give its sanction to it.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: What I said was that it was the duty of the Home Office, when an application was made for an allotment, to see that the law was carried out.

*MR. GODDARD: I think he went so far in the Standing Committee as to say that the Home Office would not encourage the granting of allotments to the Established Church. That is really the object of the Amendment, and the principle having been re-asserted, I quite agree with the hon. Member for Leicester that this Amendment should not be pressed to a division.

SIR R. C. JEBB (Cambridge University): As I had the honour to be chairman of the Select Committee, I wish to bear my testimony to the fair spirit shown by the hon. Member for Mansfield. I venture to think, after what has fallen from my right hon. friend the Home Secretary, that the hon. Member for Mansfield might be content with having moved this Amendment.

MR. JONATHAN SAMUEL (Stockton): I also appeal to my hon. friend not to press this Amendment to a division. If he presses it I am afraid many of us on this side will vote against it. If a cemetery is constructed under the Act of 1853 consecration must follow as a matter of course, but in that case it has always been the practice of the burial authority to allot a portion of the burial ground to Roman Catholics, and to give them certain privileges, but it has never been understood that the freehold of that portion should be given with the allotment. I do not agree with the remark that this Bill settles the controversy, because under Clause 2 this Bill gives power to the Home Office to go behind the local authority, although the local authority has to provide the cost of making the cemetery. In every case now under this Bill consecration must follow. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] Oh, yes it will. It is my reading of Clause 2 that consecration is bound to follow. I ask my hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment so that it may not be misconstrued.

MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: After the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman I ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: The object of the Amendment I now beg to move is to bring one portion of the Bill into harmony with another portion. One of the clauses provides that the existing fees shall continue to be levied for a certain period from the passing of this measure, whereas the final clause provides that the Act shall come into operation on 1st January next. I cannot imagine that any inconvenience will arise if the Act comes into operation as soon as it receives the Royal assent. Otherwise, for several months to come the burial authorities will be much embarrassed, in acting under a law which has only a few months to live. It would be better to adopt the date of the Act as the date when it will come into operation.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 25, to leave out the words 'first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and one,' and insert the words 'day of the passing thereof,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Carvell Williams.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: In point of form, I think if the object of this Amendment is to be effected that the best way would be to leave out the sub-clause altogether. Then the Act would come into operation on receiving the Royal assent. But great inconvenience would be caused if this Act came into operation then. There is a great deal of work to be done by the Central Departments concerned, as well as by local authorities, immediately after the passing of the Act and before it comes into operation. I do not know that there is any example of a Bill which requires so many administrative preparations as this one being brought into effect before there is time to consider them. I hope the hon. Gentleman, after consideration, will not press the Amendment.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: I do not attach importance to this Amendment. I made it suggestively, and I have no wish to press it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

LAND REGISTRY (NEW BUILDINGS) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed.

COUNTY COURTS (INVESTMENT OF DEPOSITS) BILL [Lords].

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The object of the Bill is that money which is obtained in certain cases may be invested in the Post Office Savings Banks. That is the procedure under the Act of 1897. If the money is not invested in some such way it is very apt to be squandered by those who get the control of the money. Under these circumstances this is a Bill deserving of attention, and I hope the House will be content to take the Second Reading.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Thursday.

INEBRIATES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL [Lords].

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): This is a Bill to amend the Inebriates Act which was passed in 1898. I think it is always objectionable when we have a Bill introduced in one session that it should be necessary to proceed almost in the next session to amend it. It shows the necessity when a Bill is before the House of having it properly considered, so that it should not be necessary always to bring in these amending Bills. Indeed, a great many of the Government measures consist of Bills to amend the legislation of the two previous years. Under the Inebriates Act the funds for providing homes for inebriates are to be levied in the same way as the funds for reformatory schools are levied. These funds are provided under a rate called the prisons rate, so that in order to know what is levied under the Inebriates Act you have to get the Reformatory Schools Act, and when you have found that you have to ascertain how the prisons rate is levied. That rate, I think, in almost all cases is levied on the owners. This Bill proposes to change the rate to the public health rate, which in Scotland is levied half on owners and half on occupiers. I object altogether to the public rates being used for the purpose of providing homes for inebriates. We have precedents for providing money from other sources. As the House is aware, we take certain sums of money from the duties on spirits and licensing for the purpose of aiding local rates. I would suggest that in making provision for the homes for inebriates we ought to provide the funds out of the whisky duty or some other tax of that kind. It seems to me to be a fair principle that if the sale of whisky and other spirituous liquors, which, of course, is recognised in this country, produces an evil requiring a remedy in the shape of suitable inebriate homes, then that provision should be made a special burden on that article of excise which causes drunkenness and the necessity for these homes. That is why I have put down an Amendment for the rejection of the Bill. I have done so principally to raise the question as regards the change proposed—the levying of the tax in connection with public health. As compared with the existing law, certainly the Bill is an improvement. There is no question about that. I do not know why the ratepayers should be compelled to pay for the provision of such homes when many of them do not consume spirits at all. If the burden of providing inebriate homes is placed on the taxation of spirits, you will have a wealthy fund to draw upon, and I am sure there would be no objection whatever in the country. The other point to which I wish to refer is that a new offence has been created so as to bring the inebriates within the Act. I have always a strong objection to the creation of a new offence with the view of bringing it under any particular Act. The common law of Scotland and the licensing laws are strong enough for all practical purposes. Until the Inebriates Act was brought into operation I never heard any complaint as to the law. I do not know any special reason why this new offence should be created. We will hear an explanation from the Lord Advocate, but I hold that the support of an inebriates' home should be a burden on drink itself. I beg to move that the Second Reading be postponed for three months.

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, E.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The hon. Member may rest assured that there is no intention here to create any new crime. The scheme of the Inebriates Act was to deal with offences of which drunkenness was the essence of the offence. As it happened, there were a great many offences under English law of which drunkenness was the essence of the offence, and consequently these offences were put in the schedule of the Bill. Persons who suffered conviction for these offences were liable to be put in an inebriates' home. But the law of Scotland was different. It was mostly common law and not statute law, as in England. There was this anomaly, that except in certain cities under Police Acts there were few places where drunkenness was the essence of the crime. If the Act were allowed to remain unamended it would be practically a dead letter in Scotland. The object of the Bill is to create a new offence in one sense, but it is an old offence in another sense. As regards the other matter, the rating clause, the hon. Member for Mid Lanark candidly confesses that he thinks it an improvement, but his objection is that this ought not to be a charge on the local rates at all, but on the Imperial funds. Whether the hon. Member is right or not I am not at the present moment going to discuss. It is perfectly evident that you could not expect that inebriates' homes should be made a charge on the Imperial funds in Scotland, while not so in England. The scheme of the Act of 1898 was that only criminal inebriates were to be dealt with in State inebriate reformatories; but if you come to the minor offences of drunk and disorderly when they are repeated more than a certain number of times within a certain period, then they are to be dealt with in inebriate homes provided by the local authority. That is the law in England, and you would scarcely expect that in Scotland they should be supported from the Imperial funds.

MR. JONATHAN SAMUEL (Stockton): I am afraid I cannot on this occasion follow my hon. friend into the lobby on the ground he has suggested. I quite agree with the Lord Advocate when he states that that would be an injustice to England. In a large number of places in England it has been decided not to put the Act in operation, but where they do put it in operation it must be a charge on the county funds and not a charge on the Imperial Exchequer. I regard that as a very proper manner in which to raise funds for the cost of inebriate homes, for this reason: if you bring home to the people the enormity of excessive drinking you will have better administration under the Licensing Act, and they will put the law in operation to a greater extent to prevent drunkenness than has been done in the past. I must say I am surprised that the hon. Member for Mid Lanark, who takes such a keen interest in most of these questions, should suggest on this occasion that the charge should be an Imperial one.

It being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

SUPPLY [15TH JUNE].

Resolutions reported:—

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1900-1901.

CLASS IV.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £5,585,099, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Education, and of the various Establishments connected therewith, including sundry Grants-in-Aid."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £86,280, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the

charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and other Expenses of the British Museum, and of the Natural History Museum, including certain Grants in Aid."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,374, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Gallery, and of the National Gallery of British Art, Millbank, including a Grant in Aid for the purchase of Pictures."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,520, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Portrait Gallery, including a Grant in Aid for the purchase of Portraits."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,967, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Wallace Collection (Hertford House)."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £35,724, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for sundry Grants in Aid of Scientific Investigation, etc., and other Grants."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £67,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Grants in Aid of the Expenses of certain Universities and Colleges in Great Britain, and of the Expenses under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £5, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the University of London."

CLASS V.

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £255,384, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad, and of the Consular Establishments Abroad and other Expenditure chargeable on the Consular Vote."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £167,186, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Grants in Aid of the Expenses of the British Protectorates in Uganda and in Central and East Africa, under the Uganda Railway Act, 1896."

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £256,955, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for sundry Colonial Services, including certain Grants in Aid."

12. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for a Grant in Aid of the Revenue of the Island of Cyprus."

13. "That a sum, not exceeding £14,350, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Subsidies to certain Telegraph Companies."

Resolutions agreed to.

POST OFFICE SITES [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all sums payable by the Postmaster General under any Act of the present Session to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire Lands for the Public Service, and of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect the Provisions of such Act."—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Whereupon Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Caldwell*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

EXECUTORS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS AND GUARDIANS (TERM OF OFFICE) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. JONATHAN SAMUEL objected to the Bill being considered at this hour.

MR. BUTCHER (York) appealed to the hon. Member to withdraw his opposition, remarking that the object of the Bill was simply to remedy a defect in the Local Government Act.

MR. JONATHAN SAMUEL said they were having a large number of Bills to alter that Act. If the law was to be altered the Local Government Board should take the subject up and introduce a comprehensive amending Bill.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The Local Government Board have no objection to this Bill.

MR. JONATHAN SAMUEL: The Local Government Board should bring in a measure instead of dealing with the subject in this piecemeal way.

Second Reading deferred till to-morrow.

NEW BILLS.

JURORS' PAYMENT.

Bill to regulate the summoning and payment of jurors, ordered to be brought in by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Sir Alfred Hickman, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. M'Ghee, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Emmott, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Mr. Flower, and Mr Greville.

JURORS' PAYMENT BILL.

"To regulate the summoning and payment of jurors," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 2nd July, and to be printed. [Bill 251.]

BOARDS OF GUARDIANS (MAGISTRATES).

Bill to constitute as ex-officio Magistrates the Chairmen of Boards of Guardians, ordered to be brought in by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Heath, Mr. Galloway, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Mr. Flower, and Mr. Greville.

BOARDS OF GUARDIANS (MAGISTRATES) BILL.

"To constitute as ex-officio Magistrates the Chairmen of Boards of Guardians," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 2nd July, and to be printed. [Bill 252.]

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 19th June, 1900.

The Earl of MORLEY—Sat Speaker.

SAT FIRST.

The Duke of Argyll sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD SPEAKER acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

Ilfracombe Improvement.
London County Council (Improvements).

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway [H.L.].
Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

CHARING CROSS AND STRAND ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

A petition of Sir Prior Goldney, Remembrancer of the City of London, praying for leave to present a petition of the Corporation of London praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill although the time limited by Standing Order No. 93 for presenting such petition has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table; and Standing Order No. 93 to be considered on Thursday next in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition.

ABERDEEN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 18th and the 25th of May last discharged, and Bill committed.

SOUTH SHIELDS CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Reported with Amendments.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

WITHINGTON URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL [H.L.].

Reported with Amendments.

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Select Committee without amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

CITY OF LONDON ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

ABERDEEN POLICE AND IMPROVEMENT BILL.

CHARING CROSS AND STRAND ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LATIMER ROAD AND ACTON RAILWAY BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

SOUTH EASTERN METROPOLITAN TRAMWAYS BILL.

EAST LONDON WATER BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

CITY OF LONDON (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LIVERPOOL CORPORATION BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

WOLVERHAMPTON GAS BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed for Monday next.

LONDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

GLASGOW BUILDING REGULATIONS BILL [H.L.].

BURY AND DISTRICT WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [H.L.].

SHEFFIELD CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

SALFORD CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

GLASGOW DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

PRESTON CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

CENTRAL LONDON RAILWAY BILL.

Read 3^a, and passed.

STOCKPORT CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

WAKEFIELD CORPORATION MARKET BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

OSSETT CORPORATION GAS BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

GREAT YARMOUTH PORT AND HAVEN BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

BRITISH GASLIGHT COMPANY (STAFFORDSHIRE POTTERIES) BILL.

LANCASTER CORPORATION BILL.

RICKMANSWORTH AND UXBRIDGE VALLEY WATER BILL.

SAINT DAVID'S RAILWAY ABANDONMENT BILL.

WEST BROMWICH CORPORATION BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

GREAT BERKHAMPSTEAD WATER BILL [H.L.].

MENSTONE WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [H.L.].

NEWPORT CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

NEWTOWN AND LLANLLWCHAIARN URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

LANCASHIRE INEBRIATES ACTS BOARD BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Report of the Departmental Committee on Scottish Prisons; with minutes of evidence, appendices, and index.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Forty-third Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1899-1900.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION).

General Report for the year 1899, by the Rev. F. F. Cornish, Chief Inspector.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA).

Return of all loans raised in India under the provisions of any Acts of Parliament chargeable on the revenues of India outstanding at the commencement of the half year ended on the 31st March, 1900, with the rates of interest and total amount payable thereon, etc.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute dated 30th May, 1900, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the offices of (1) Junior Inspector, and (2)

Instructor in the Royal College of Art, Board of Education, South Kensington, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required.

RAILWAY COMPANIES POWERS ACT, 1864.

Report by the Board of Trade on an application made during the year 1899 under the Act, and of the proceedings of the Board of Trade with respect thereto.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

EDUCATION.

Return of the various Voluntary Schools Associations in England and Wales, with the number of children in average attendance in the schools in each Association, differentiating between rural and urban schools, and showing the total amount of Aid Grant allotted in respect of each class of schools; and further giving the rate of Aid Grant per head of average attendance, and the gain or loss to each Association under the present differential mode of allotment as compared with an allotment of 5s. per child in all schools; ordered to be laid before the House.—(*The Lord Heneage.*)

NAVAL RESERVE (MOBILISATION) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Earl of Hopetoun.*)

*EARL SPENCER: I do not rise to offer any opposition to this Bill. In fact, I desire in every possible way, not only in the interests of the Admiralty but of the Reserve men themselves, to give facilities for the modification of any very strict rules with reference to the calling out of the Reserve. When this Bill was introduced elsewhere several objections were taken to it. One objection—I do not think there was any foundation for it, but I should like to be assured on the point—was that there was an intention, by the Bill, to dispense with the notification, on the part of Her Majesty, of the necessity for mobilising the Reserve when the powers were put in force. I trust that is not so. I do not possess a legal mind, but I really cannot see how the necessity for this Bill arises. We heard the other night from the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War that it often happened that some regiments wanted their Reservists of the Second Division long before other regiments wanted the same Reservists, but that under the law as it at present stands a regiment which is deficient in respect of its Reservists cannot call up any one of its Second Division Reservists until all the other regiments who might not require them have called up the Reservists of the same class. And the noble Marquess added that, in order to enable one Line regiment to get the men it wanted, the War Office were obliged to call up the whole of the remainder of the Reservists of that Division, and, as they did not require them, to send them away on furlough. No doubt, to avoid a thing of that sort, it is desirable to give similar powers to the Admiralty; but when I turn to the Act which regulates the calling out of the Reserve it appears to me that the powers given in this Bill already exist. Clause 4 of the Act gives the Admiralty power—

> "to order and direct that the Volunteers under this Act, or so many or such part of them as Her Majesty may deem necessary, shall be called in to actual service."

It may be said that they are all called out for a specified time—three years; but in Clause 14 of that Act there is a power given to the Admiralty to "discharge Volunteers raised under this Act." I therefore do not see why it is necessary to give these new powers under this Bill. If, however, according to legal interpretation, such a necessity exists, I should not for a moment wish to oppose the Bill; but as there is some doubt on the subject in the minds of people who are interested in it I would ask the noble Earl who has introduced the Bill to satisfy me on that point, as well as the first one to which I referred.

*THE EARL OF HOPETOUN: I think I can give an assurance to the noble Earl on the first point. There is no intention of interfering with the Proclamation in any way. With regard to the second point raised by the noble Earl, I hold in my hand a very strong opinion from the

Law Officers of the Crown that the alterations proposed are absolutely necessary. If the noble Earl will allow the Bill to pass its Second Reading I will undertake to again confer with the Law Officers of the Crown and place their further opinion before him at some future date.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

COUNTY COUNCILS (ELECTIONS) ACT (1891) AMENDMENT BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

COLONIAL MARRIAGES (DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1:—

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: The object of my Amendment is to restore the wording of the Bill to that of the Bill of 1898 as it left your Lordships' House. As originally introduced, it did not carry out the intention of its promoters, who desired to limit the operation of the Bill to the marriage of persons actually domiciled in the colonies and to exclude that class of persons known as "carpet baggers," who might visit the colonies simply for the purpose of getting married there and evading the law. My noble friend Lord Strathcona fully intended to introduce the Bill this session as amended in 1898, but by a strange accident, for which no one, I believe, is responsible, the original Bill was substituted.

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 1, page 1, line 7, to leave out 'between a man and his deceased wife's sister'; and in line 9, after 'possession' to insert 'between a man and his deceased wife's sister, both being domiciled therein.'"—(*Lord James of Hereford.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 110.)

LAND CHARGES BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

BURIAL GROUNDS BILL. (No. 111.)

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND) BILL. (No. 112.)

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and to be printed.

LAND REGISTRY (NEW BUILDINGS) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred the Examiners. (No. 113.)

The House adjourned at a quarter before Five of the clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 19th June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS—SUGGESTED DISTINCTIVE TITLES.

On the Order for the Second Reading of a number of Local Government Provisional Order Bills,

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said: I want to make a suggestion, the adoption of which, I believe, would be a great convenience to Members of this House. It is that some title should be given to these Provisional Order Bills. Yesterday there were five on the Paper, and there are six to-day, and in the form in which they stand it is impossible to tell to what places they refer.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): I entirely agree with the hon. Gentleman that there is a defect in this matter which might well be remedied, and I will take an early opportunity of communicating with the authorities of the House with a view to carrying out the suggestion next session.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I may point out that the list is printed every Monday, and that from that the information desired can be obtained.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: That shows how easy it would be to apply the remedy.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL [ANNUITIES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the creation of Annuities to be charged on and payable out of the Revenues of India in lieu of the sum of money amounting to £34,859,217 17s. 6d. agreed upon for the purchase by the Secretary of State in Council of India of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, and the payment of any costs and expenses incurred by the said Secretary of State under any Act of the present session for vesting the said undertaking in the said Secretary of State in Council of India; and also any costs, charges, and expenses of obtaining and passing the said Act not provided by the surplus profits arising from the said undertaking for the half-year ending the 30th day of June 1900."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I regret I had yesterday to move the postponement of this motion. I only did so because we really had no information on the subject till the Motion was read out at the Table. The figures involved are very large; they amount to nearly thirty-five millions. I do not for a moment dispute the propriety of the purchase of the railway, nor do I question the method by which the purchase is effected—namely, by the payment of annuities for a certain term of years in lieu of a lump sum down. I should, however, like to ask the noble Lord one or two questions. First, what is the period for which these annuities will run—is it thirty, forty, or fifty years? Then I wish to draw attention to the second part of the resolution. It is clear that the annuities are to be a charge upon the Indian revenues, but I doubt whether the clause with regard to the expense of passing the Act may not constitute a charge on the revenues of the United Kingdom. If the noble Lord will look at the fifth line and onwards he will see what I mean. It refers to the expenses incurred by the Secretary of State, and it appears to me from the wording that they may become a charge on the revenues of the United Kingdom. I thought so yesterday when I heard the resolution read at the Table, and hence I asked to have the matter postponed in order that we might get an explanation from the noble Lord. I have one further observation to make, and it is a suggestion which I commend to the consideration of the noble Lord and of the Government generally. It is that when a resolution is to be moved dealing with a large sum—and this one deals with nearly thirty-five millions—the terms should be given us not on the Blue Paper, because, perhaps, that is too much to ask, but on the White Paper, or, if that cannot be done, on a separate Paper, so that hon. Members may be enabled to gather some idea as to what is asked of them. Otherwise, they are rendered practically incapable of discussing the matter. I am aware that this has not hitherto been the practice, but I suggest that the practice is a faulty one, and as there is, as far as I know, no law, written or unwritten, enforcing the observance of what is admittedly an extremely inconvenient practice, I submit that it might well be amended in the manner I have indicated.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): This is a Bill for the acquisition by the Government of India of a great railway by means of an arrangement which I am glad to say will be financially advantageous to the Government. The Government of India had the option of acquiring the property by two methods of purchase, either by paying a lump sum or by annuity, and they have adopted the latter system for convenience. In fact, they have pursued an analagous course to that adopted in the case of all Bills by which they have in past years acquired possession of similar undertakings. The annuity is to run for fifty years, and includes a sinking fund. No charge whatsoever will be placed on the revenues of this country. The words in the latter part of the motion have been inserted because it is possible that the surplus profits of this line, which passes at once into the hands of the Government, may not be sufficient to meet all the expenses of this Act. I quite agree with my hon. friend that when a transaction of this magnitude is brought before the House, it should be done in such a way that hon. Members may understand what they are about. This is a private Bill, and therefore I am not, in that sense, responsible for the method by which it is introduced to the House; if I had known that it was coming before the House, I would have taken care that in some way or other this resolution was so far brought to the notice of hon. Members, that they would have understood the nature of the transaction.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I do not dispute that the motion is in order, but I wish to ask whether it would not be possible to make this a public instead of a private Bill. This is a great measure for the nationalisation of an Indian Railway, and I think we ought to have some little further information with regard to it. Is this stage merely a preliminary to the introduction of the Bill?

LORD G. HAMILTON: We have followed exactly the precedent which has always been adopted in these cases. The railway is purchased under a contract, and it is necessary to get the assent of the House in order that the annuities may be substituted for the Government guarantee of interest.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I want to know at what point we are now. Is this a motion preliminary to the introduction of the Bill?

LORD G. HAMILTON: The Bill has been brought in and read a second time.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It seems to me absurd that a Bill such as this should go to the Unopposed Private Bill Committee. It imposes an enormous charge upon the revenues of India, and I do not think it is proper that it should be dealt with as a private Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! That is not the question now before the House.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I am only suggesting that it might be possible, although the Bill has been brought in as a private Bill, to switch it off into the line of public Bills. It is very inconvenient that a Bill of this magnitude should be brought in as a private Bill.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I also wish to enter the strongest possible protest against the procedure which has been adopted in this case. I thought this was the usual financial resolution preparatory to the introduction of the Bill. I know of no precedent for a Bill which is practically in the charge of the Secretary of State for India being brought in by a private Member.

LORD G. HAMILTON: But it is a private Bill.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I say it ought not to be a private Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That objection should have been taken before the Second Reading.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I do submit that the Secretary for India should have taken care that the House was well informed of the meaning of this resolution before it was asked to pass it.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): The noble Lord has informed us that he is not responsible for the form in which this Bill has been introduced into this House. But he must have known perfectly well what its contents were, and it was only due to the House, even if it was a private Bill, that he should have made it acquainted with the details of a transaction involving a sum of thirty-five millions sterling, before he asked it to sanction the arrangement. Great issues are involved, and it is only right that the House should have some opportunity of discussing the important question raised by this resolution. Our hands, however, are practically tied by the manner in which the Bill has been introduced.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the creation of Annuities to be charged on and payable out of the Revenues of India in lieu of the sum of money amounting to £34,859,217 17s. 6d. agreed upon for the purchase by the Secretary of State in Council of India of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, and the payment of any costs and expenses incurred by the said Secretary of State under any Act of the present session for vesting the said undertaking in the said Secretary of State in Council of India; and also any costs, charges, and expenses of obtaining and passing the said Act not provided by the surplus profits arising from the said undertaking for the half-year ending the 30th day of June, 1900. —(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

BRITISH GAS LIGHT COMPANY (STAFFORDSHIRE POTTERIES) BILL.

RICKMANSWORTH AND UXBRIDGE VALLEY WATER BILL.

SAINT DAVID'S RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

LANCASTER CORPORATION BILL.

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time. —(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Queen's consent signified. Bill read the third time, and passed.

WEST BROMWICH CORPORATION BILL.

As amended, considered.

A Clause added.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BRIGHTON AND PRESTON UNITED DISTRICT, &c.) BILL [Lords.]

Read a second time, and committed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (No. 2) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 13) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 15) BILL.

PERTH AND PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

LONDON (ST. MARYLEBONE) PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of a certain area situated in the Parish of St. Marylebone, in the County of London, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley.

Ordered, That Standing Order 193A be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the first time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

LONDON (ST. MARYLEBONE) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of a certain area situated in the Parish of St. Marylebone, in the County of London," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 253.]

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 7).

Mr. HOLLAND reported from the Committee on Group 7 of Railway Bills, That Mr. Cameron Corbett, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND) BILL.

BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY BILL.

Reported, with Amendments. Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

Colonel GUNTER reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills, That Mr. Coghill, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP D).

Mr. ALEXANDER HARGREAVES BROWN reported from the Committee on Group D of Private Bills, That Mr. Murnaghan, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present at the sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—
Southport Water Bill,
Hastings Harbour Bill,
Maidenhead Gas Bill, without amendment.
Hoylake and West Kirby Improvement Bill,
Southport Extension and Tramways Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—
Manchester Ship Canal Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Dungannon Gas." Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Barmouth, Brecon, Clacton, Cleckheaton, Hythe, Liversedge, Llandilo, Ramsgate, Romford, and Sandgate." Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, relating to Broughty Ferry, Dunblane, and Wormit and Woodhaven." Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Liverpool Overhead Railway Company to make certain new railways; and for other purposes." Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend and extend the provisions of the Glasgow Police Acts, 1866 to 1899, relating to streets, sewers, and buildings." Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to constitute and incorporate a Joint Water Board consisting of representatives from the councils of the respective boroughs of Bury, Haslingden, and Rawtenstall, and the urban districts of Radcliffe, Ramsbottom, Little Lever, Whitefield, and Tottington, and the rural district of Bury, all in the county palatine of Lancaster; and to transfer to and vest in such Board the water undertaking of the Bury Corporation; and for other purposes." Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to extend the boundaries of the city of Sheffield; to consolidate certain of the townships within the said city; to empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the said city to construct additional lines of tramways and to execute various street widenings and other works; to make further and better provision for the improvement, health, and good government of the city; and for other purposes." Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Salford, to make street improvements, to construct sewers, and to raise additional moneys by mortgage and by the creation and issue of stock, and to make further provisions for the good government of the borough." Salford Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Glasgow District Tramways Company, and to empower that Company to make and maintain Tramways; and for other purposes." Glasgow District Tramways Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company for making works and acquiring lands, and raising and applying capital moneys, and other matters relating to their several undertakings; and for other purposes." Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to alter the numbers and boundaries of the wards of the borough of Preston, and to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the said borough to reconstruct their existing, and to construct additional tramways in and adjacent to the borough; and to make further provisions for the good government of the borough." Preston Corporation Bill [Lords].

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 254.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 255.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 256.]

LIVERPOOL OVERHEAD RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

GLASGOW BUILDING REGULATIONS BILL [Lords].

BURY AND DISTRICT WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

SHEFFIELD CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

SALFORD CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

GLASGOW DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

PRESTON CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

Petitions from Aberdeen, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

DOGS REGULATION BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Lossiemouth; Brechin; Peeble; Wishaw; Johnstone; Hawick; Perth; Broughty Ferry; and Dysart; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Aberdeen; and Stirling; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Petitions against, from Fulham; and South Paddington; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Arbroath and St. Vigeant; and Glasgow; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Ticehurst; Petersfield; Fulham; Prescot; and Drayton; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Stamford; High Wycombe; Cooling; Lewisham; Morpeth; East Cramlington; Bedlington;

Blyth; Shoreham; Lyminster; Choppington; North Sunderland; Swindon; Bebside; Gloucester; Ilkeston; Melbourne; Gretton; Seaton Delaval; Whitley Bay; Lymington; Leighton Buzzard; Lee; Plymouth; Shankhouse; Backworth; Lewes; Wigan; and Newark-on-Trent; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against, from Widnes; St. Helens; Blackburn; Camborne; Bury; Worcester; Cardiff; Bolton; Wigan; and Dundee; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Pontypridd; Hammersmith; Tower Hamlets; High Wycombe; Shaftesbury; Penarth; Cardiff (thirty-one); Bromsgrove (two); Yardley; Melbourne; Canterbury; Dartford; South Hackney; Broxtowe; Calne; Corsham; Lower Bourne; Nottingham (seventeen); Tyldesley; Blandford; Liversedge (two); Birmingham (three); Wyke; Deptford (two); Whitehaven; Lesmahagow; Pontypool; Bradley; Seaton Delaval; Halesowen; Little Lever; Wortham; Saxmundham; Reigate; Stanwick; Buckhurst Hill; Heckmondwike; Wellingborough; West Brixton; Selby Oak; Bradford (three); Desborough; Aldershot; Buckhurst Hill; Langley Moor; Brixton (two); Throckley; Cilfynydd; Metheringham; Swansea; Kingsbridge; Raunds; Uffculme; Fleckney; Calfaria; Stratford; Lechlade; Newcastle; Flimby; Bath (two); Blackburn; Hackney Road; Wilton; Thatto Heath; Fulham (two); Whitley Bay; Warmley Tower (two); Wycombe; Farnham; Lyminge; Cramlington; Pontesnewynydd; Wandsworth; Balham; Hull; Scottish National Sabbath School Union; Clapton; Newington; Stoke Newington; Lewisham; Hampstead (three); London; Ringwood; Lymington; Brondesbury; Avonmouth (two); Primrose Hill; Petersfield (two); Redhill (three); Henley-on-Thames; Stoke Newington; Sutton Cornwood; Widnes; Hackney; Kennington; Much Woolton; Frome; Nunney; South Devon; Glasgow (three); Brynmawr (two); Llanelly (two); Builth Wells; Long Compton; Ystradgynlais; Stratford-on-Avon (two); Poole; Wellington; Taunton; Paddington; High Wycombe; Liverpool; Barwell; Stamford; Nuneaton; Perth; Kenninghall; St. Austell; Chard; Hay; Wadebridge; Mevagissey (three); West Hampstead; St. David's; Dundee; Tottenham; Wisbech; Leverington; Murrow; Clerkenwell; Wootton Bassett; Wroughton Road; Stratton St. Margaret's; Blunsden; Swindon; Norham; Tweedmouth; Broadmead; Doncaster (two); Glastonbury (two); Street; Somerton (two); Brewham; Langport; Charlton Adam; Keinton Mandeville; Boston; Bitterne; Whitchurch; Lenham; Boughton Morchelsea; Headcorn; Woburn Sands; Leeds (three); Totterdown; Southampton (two); Darlaston; Martock; Newton Abbot; Abercarn; Exeter; City Road; Parkstone; Wookey Hole; Weston-super-Mare (three); Newark; Gerizim; Newport (Mon.); Felixstowe; Yatton; Bamburgh; Seahouses; Williton (two): Llantrissant; Paddington; Bristol (thirty-seven); Christon Bank; North Sunderland; Hyde; Marple; Ilfracombe; Appledore; Fishponds; Maryport; West Bromwich; Devizes; Wanborough; Chiseldon; Wroughton; Lydiard Millicent; Highworth; Rishton; Accrington (nine); Oswaldtwistle (four); Clayton-le-Moors; Huncoat; Forest Gate; Leigh; Upper Stratton; Swindon; Bishopston; Penryn; Gloucester; Heanor: Ripley; Upper Ettingshall; Hitchin; Weare; Stone Allerton; Winscombe; Boulward; Burnham (two); Peterborough (three); Drybrook; Newent; Coleford; Woodbridge; Wednesbury; Dulwich; Newton Moor; Wells (two); Ystradyfodwg; Hornsea; South Newsham; Bolton; Northampton; Wrington; Ashton-under-Lyne; Radcliffe; Keswick (three); Penrith; Caldbeck; Wigton; St. John's Wood; Marylebone; Hoyland; Bedford Leigh; Liverpool; Carlisle; Bilston; Allonby (two); Lowton; Thrandeston; Oldham (three); Sowerby Bridge; Mellis Chapel; Grangetown; Liverpool (four); Pant; Norland; Kidderminster (two); Richmond; Yeovil; Hull; Hayfield (two); Tow Law; Chinley; Brynmawr; Cowbridge; Llanfihangel Fechan; Llywel; Priestfield; Llanbedo; Llanfigan; Hoddesdon; Newtown Wigan; Goose Green; Ramsey (Hunts); Lincoln; Stoke under Ham; Stithians; Bermondsey; Sunderland (eight); Burrows; Bradford (three); Montacute; Hillcommon; Shankhouse; Brentwood; Trealaw; Ystradyfodwg (three); Pendoylan; Newport; Maindee; Newcastle under Lyme; Packmoor (two); Draycott Street; Bishop's Hull; Wellington; St. Lawrence, Ramsgate; Ramsgate (two); New Hirst; Highbury; Widdington Colliery; Horsleydown; Old Kent Road; Wigan (four); Backworth; Paddington; Hollingworth; Westhoughton; Preston; Lye; Sheffield (twenty-two; Netherseale; Wiveliscombe; Morpeth; Cramlington; Bedlington; Bebside; Blyth; Catford; Lee; Blackheath; Lewisham; Baddeley Edge; Farnworth; Liskeard; Huddersfield (four); Berry Brow; Aspatria (two); Cambridge (two); Maryport (three); Hayton; Ellenborough; Harriston; Arlingham; Lydbrook; St. Briavels; Cinderford; Newnham; Blakeney; Crewkerne; Chudleigh Knighton; Dartmouth (three); Kingsteignton; Choppington; Ealing; Little Hallingbury; Selly Park; Brayton; Adsett; Leeds (five); Lewes; Gravesend (thirteen); Northfleet (two); Carlisle Cross; Watchet; and Oswestry; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Lochee; Kilmarnock; Fowlis Easter; Liff; Glasgow (three); British Women's Temperance Association; Melrose; Mains; Forfar; Kilmuir Easter; Stonehouse; Galashiels; Selkirk; St. George Lodge of Independent Order of Good Templars; Coldstream; St. Andrews; Cullicudden; Earlston; Blairgowrie; Edinburgh; Scone; Stanley; Auldearn; Dundee (twenty-five); Rathven; and Innerleithen; to lie upon the Table.

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION (SCOTLAND) ACT (1895) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, against; to lie upon the Table.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS ON ACTIVE SERVICE.

Petition from Fulham, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Newport Pagnell; Melbourne; Netherseale; Canterbury; Heckmondwike (two); Sheffield (five); Norristhorpe; Birmingham (four); Tyldesley; West Brixton; Hawarden; Pontypool; Whitley Bay; Little Lever; Wortham; Saxmundham; Bargoed; Halesowen; Selly Oak; Desborough; Bradford (eight); Seaton Delaval; Throckley; Cilfynydd; Raunds; Calfaria; Stratford; Leicester; Thatts Heath; Cwft; Fleckney; Nottingham; Stoke Newington; South Devon; Lymington; Exeter; Redhill (two); Monson Road; Henley-on-Thames; Much Woolton; Widnes; Brynmawr; Brecknock; Builth Wells; Llanelly; Ynys; Martock; Barwell; Chard; St. Austell; Mevagissey (two); Hay; Kenninghall; Stamford; St. Davids; Hoo; Woburn Sands; Tottenham; Whitchurch; Plymouth; Wisbech; Murrow; Leverington; Wroughton Road; Blunsden; Stratton St. Margarets; Swindon; Berwick; London (four); Doncaster (two); Southampton; Abercarn; Montacute; Mellis; Pendoylan; Ystradyfodwg (two); Shankhouse; Sunderland; Carlisle (two); South Newsham; Marple; Upper Ettingshall; Hollingworth; Newton Moor; Hyde; Westhoughton; Barry; Bolton (four); West Melton; Llwynypia; Felixstowe; Preston; Wigan (five); Devizes; Llywel; Llanbedr; Shoreham; Llanfihangelfechan; Pant; Oswestry; Wrington; Penrith; Keswick; Coldbeck; Wigton (two); Bristol (eleven); Morpeth; East Cramlington; Bedlington Colliery (two); Bebside; Cramlington; Blyth; Parland; Liverpool; Sowerby Bridge; Priestfield; Crewkerne; South Petherton; Bedford Leigh: Catford; Lee: Blackheath; Yardley; West Bromwich; Farnworth; Llanfegan; Oldham (three); Llanfairfechan; Choppington; Arlingham; Lydbrook; Cinderford; Blakeney; Leeds; Shoreham (two); Lewes (two); Paddingtou; Criston Bank; Bamburgh; Ilfracombe; Barnstaple; Newport (Mon.) (two); Upper Stratton; Chiseldon; Wroughton; Lydiard Millicent; Highworth; Wanborough; Clayton le Moors; Accrington (eleven); Penryn; Falmouth; Gloucester (two); Heanor; Ilkeston; Belston; Hitchin; Peterborough (three); Drybrook; Newent; Coleford; Leigh; Wednesbury; Lowton; Trevithin; Brynmawr; Cardiff; Sea Houses; Wood Green Bamborough; Backworth; Williton; Yatton; Wachet; Pontypool; Yeovil; Blaenavon; Wiveliscombe; Abersychan; Govan; Ramsey; Packmoor; Thrandestone; Calne; Wilton; Bath; Newcastle on Tyne; Lechlade; Goose Green; Oswaldtwistle (two); and Richmond; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Tyldesley; Pyntypool; Llanwono; Llanelly; Builth Wells; Ystradgynlais; Hay; St. Davids; Whitchurch; Abercarn; Cowbridge; Trecastle; Llanfihangel-fechan; Llanfigan; Pendoylan; and Llanbedi; to lie upon the Table.

TEINDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

VAGRANTS' CHILDREN PROTECTION BILL.

Petition of the Association of School Boards of England and Wales, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE.

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee on Scottish Prisons, with Minutes of Evidence, Appendices, and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA).

Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 31st March, 1900, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 216.]

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WARNED.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd May; *Sir Francis Powell*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 217.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING, 1899.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 218.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 219.]

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Copy presented, of Forty-third Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1899-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 30th May, 1900, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of (1) Junior Inspector, and (2) Instructor in the Royal College of Art, Board of Education, South Kensington, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of Inspectors of Irish Fisheries on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (EXCEPTIONS TO QUEEN'S REGULATIONS).

Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Queen's Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances during the year 1899–1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WHISKY IN BOND (SCOTLAND).

Return ordered, "showing the total quantities of whisky in bond (distinguishing the quantities in general warehouses from the quantities in distillers' warehouses) in each excise collection in Scotland on the 30th day of June, 1900."—(*Mr. Gordon.*)

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION).

Return ordered, "showing the extent to which, and the manner in which, local authorities in Scotland have allocated and applied funds to the purposes of Technical Education during the year ending 15th day of May, 1900, under the following Acts:—Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890; Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892; Technical Schools (Scotland) Act, 1887; Technical Instruction Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1892;

and Public Libraries Acts."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—DISASTERS NEAR LINDLEY ON THE 1ST JUNE.

MR. BUTCHER (York): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is in a position to give any details as to the disaster to the 13th Battalion Imperial Yeomanry on 1st June; and, whether the wounded belonging to that battalion are in the hands of the British or the Boers.

GENERAL RUSSELL (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Government have received any further official details regarding the disasters to the regiment of Yeomanry and to the Sherwood Foresters.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.) (for Mr. WYNDHAM): No details of the disasters to the 13th Battalion Imperial yeomanry and to the 4th Battalion Derbyshire Regiment have yet been received. The wounded Yeomanry are for the most part at Lindley in the charge of General Paget; some however, are at Reitz, which, it is believed, is still held by the enemy.

MR. BUTCHER: Will inquiries be made of the military authorities in South Africa as to the causes which led to these disasters?

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: As a matter of course, inquiry will be made hereafter into every reverse.

MR. BUTCHER: Will the hon. Gentleman give an assurance that an immediate inquiry will be made into the cause of this disaster, which has caused great pain in Dublin, Belfast, and other places where the Yeomanry battalion was raised?

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: I will inform my noble friend the Secretary of War of the anxiety with regard to this matter expressed by my hon. friend.

LOST FIELD SERVICE EQUIPMENT—OFFICERS' RESPONSIBILITIES.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether officers and soldiers who have lost personal effects recognised as field service equipment by the capture of a convoy by the enemy will receive compensation at the public expense; and whether an inquiry is held in each case when a convoy is captured, and, if neglect of duty by want of proper precautions be ascertained, whether the officer in charge is called upon to make good any part of such losses or is otherwise held to account.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): Officers and soldiers who have lost personal effects which are recognised as field service equipment will receive compensation. The question whether operations in the field have been properly conducted is decided in the first instance by the Commander-in-Chief in the theatre of war. The Secretary of State for War has power under the pay warrant to call upon an officer to make good small losses for which he has been held responsible, but it has never been contemplated that any officer even if blameable would be called upon to make good the loss of a convoy.

NUMBER OF BRITISH TROOPS SENT TO SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state what is the number of the armed forces of all ranks and descriptions which was landed in South Africa between 1st August, 1899, and 31st May, 1900.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The number of men landed in South Africa between the dates mentioned amounts to 204,000.

MARTIAL LAW—STATISTICS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what is the number of persons who have been arrested under its provisions in the districts in South Africa where martial law has been proclaimed, how many of these have been brought to trial, and with what result; whether, and, if so, in how many cases has the intervention of the Supreme Court been invoked, and with what results; whether, and, if so, in how many cases have persons arrested been discharged by the military authorities after conviction and sentence on an appeal being made to the Supreme Court, but irrespective of any intervention on its part; and how many persons arrested have been discharged without being brought to trial.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): Directions for the guidance of officers charged with the administration of martial law were issued to all such officers, and they were subsequently instructed to furnish a record of any proceedings taken under martial law. Pending the arrival of such information it is not possible to furnish such a statement as the hon. Member asks for.

CASUALTY LISTS.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether during this war and the constant arrival of casualty lists he can arrange for some responsible officer to be at the War Office early in the morning, or certainly by 10 a.m., to give parents and friends information as to the names on the lists.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): Throughout the war responsible clerks have been in attendance at the War Office earlier than the hour mentioned by the hon. Member every day except Sundays to give information in regard to casualties.

MR. BARTLEY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the parents of an officer called at the War Office at 10.10 the other morning to inquire as to the casualties in a certain regiment, and that no one was there to give them any information, while the reply form they filled up has not produced any information since?

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: I am not aware of that particular incident. My information is that at that hour there are clerks in attendance prepared to give information.

NON-DELIVERY OF SOLDIERS' CHRISTMAS PRESENTS.

SIR J. LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, if he can explain why thousands of packages of Christmas presents carefully addressed to our officers and soldiers in South Africa and duly landed at Capetown have not yet been delivered, and especially why three truck loads of parcels were thrown into the Orange River.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): I have no information of the matter to which the hon. Member refers. Doubtless some parcels may not have been delivered, but the vast majority reached their destination in spite of the immense difficulties of delivery to men whose location is being constantly changed.

CODE CABLEGRAMS TO THE CAPE.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool Exchange): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether it is now possible to give instructions for an immediate resumption of cypher messages between English commercial houses and their correspondents at Cape Town.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer this. The reply is—No, Sir, I am afraid that it is not possible at present to relax the regulations with regard to code and cypher telegrams.

ROYAL ENGINEERS AND ARTILLERY PROMOTION REGULATIONS.

MR. C. E. SHAW (Stafford): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that in the infantry and cavalry lieutenants are promoted to fill vacancies irrespective of their service, and seeing that such promotion is being attained at the present moment in about seven or eight years, the rule that lieutenants in the Royal Engineers and Artillery can in no case receive promotion until they have served eleven years in that rank may be considered.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): There is no such rule as the hon. Member suggests. In the Royal Artillery the promotion to captain follows the same rules as in the cavalry or infantry. In the Royal Engineers subalterns have the advantage that, while they can at any time be promoted to fill a vacancy, they cannot under any circumstances wait longer than eleven years, as they must be promoted at the end of that period of service.

MR. C. E. SHAW: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the average rate of promotion is eleven years in the Royal Engineers?

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: I am informed that the average is considerably less than seven years.

MR. C. E. SHAW: Eleven years.

MOBILISATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR HOME DEFENCE.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state, in the event of augmentation of the Home Army by the mobilisation of the Volunteer Force, what organisation of the Land Forces the Government propose to adopt, and whether the organisation has been taken in hand and how far it has progressed.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The organisation of the troops at home is the same as that which has held good for several years past. Owing to the absence of the force in South Africa the various units have been re-allotted and more use has been made of the Volunteers. Every organised unit has been or will be shortly informed of its allotment and duty in the event of general mobilisation.

MILITIA OFFICERS' COMMISSIONS—EXAMINATIONS.

GENERAL LAURIE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether Militia officers competing in examinations for commissions in the Line in September next will be required to pass in literary and scientific subjects, and sô give advantage to those stationed in large garrisons who can attend garrison classes of instruction, or to those in large centres of population where they can obtain private tuition, as compared with those officers at out stations where such arrangements are not practicable; and, whether, as a number of young men have been given commissions lately without any examination, who have had no military training, solely on the recommendation of the heads of institutions which they are attending for purposes of education, he can see his way to accept the recommendation of the Commanding Officer as to the literary qualification of all such Militia officers, and confine competitive subjects to those military matters in which all officers wherever stationed will have an equal chance.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The arrangements in regard to the examinations referred to are under consideration and will, it is hoped, be published at an early date.

GENERAL LAURIE: May I hope that the officers serving with the Militia battalions in South Africa will receive the same consideration as is granted to other officers?

[No answer was returned.]

MILITIA OFFICERS' LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

MR. C. E. SHAW: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that officers of embodied Militia regiments in the Western District are restricted to obtaining leave of absence for a few days only at a time, no matter how urgent their reasons may be for obtaining such leave; and whether, in view of the fact that many of these officers are dependent upon a business or profession, instructions can be given for some further indulgence in the matter of leave being granted, provided such indulgence does not interfere with military efficiency.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): Instructions were issued to all general officers commanding on the 14th March that Militia officers were to be granted short periods of leave when possible for the purpose of attending to their private affairs, but the Service must have tha first call on their time, and it is desirable to interfere as little as possible with the discretion left to general officers.

COLCHESTER CAMP RIFLE RANGE.

MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that a number of Volunteers from Norfolk and other places will shortly assemble at Colchester Camp for musketry training, and that the rifle range there, which has cost the country £40,000, is still unopened, whether he can give an assurance that it will be open in time for the reception of the Volunteers.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The range will be opened at once, as the difficulties with the neighbouring owners have just been settled, and it will be ready for the Volunteers when they go into camp.

NAVAL MANŒUVRES.

SIR EDWARD GOURLEY (Sunderland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will state the number and class of ships that are to be employed at this year's naval manœuvres, and for how many days they are to continue; also, will experiments be made in coaling a portion of the squadrons from colliers at sea, and whether it is intended that submarine torpedo boats shall form part of the equipment of some of the ships, seeing that this type of craft is now being largely adopted in connection with other navies; and whether detachments of the land forces will in any way co-operate with the fleets in practising the landing and embarkation of men, guns, and stores, similarly to the combinations which took place in connection with the French naval manœuvres last year in the Mediterranean.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): I wish to treat my hon. friend with every courtesy, but I hope he will not press me for any information with regard to the naval manœuvres. The arrangements will not be finally settled until towards the middle of July.

INDIAN FAMINE—GRANTS TO NATIVE STATES — PROPOSED PARLIAMENTARY GRANT — RELIEF ORGANISATION — REMISSION OF HOME CHARGES.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state to which Native States advances of money have been made to help them in dealing with the famine, and what the amount has been in each case.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): On the 31st May I telegraphed to India for a detailed statement of advances made to Native States for famine purposes, but I have not yet received the figures up to date. Papers which have come before me show that some time back there had been advanced to States in Rajputana, £250,000; to States in Central India, £50,000; to States in Kathiawar, £50,000; to States in the Central Provinces, £20,000. A famine loan of £500,000 has also been sanctioned for the Hyderabad State under the guarantee of the Indian Government.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverampton, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, having regard to the appeal made by the Viceroy of India to the Lord Mayor of London for charitable contributions on behalf of the sufferers by the famime in India, the time has arrived for asking Parliament for a grant from Imperial funds. In putting this question I should like to add at the end the words "to the Indian Exchequer," in order to make it quite clear that I am not proposing that the grant should be made to the Lord Mayor's Fund.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The Viceroy's letter was intended to give information as to the purposes to which the money subscribed had been applied, the good results obtained, and the need of further subscriptions for the same objects. But it does not affect the question whether the financial resources of India are sufficient for the task which the Government of that country has undertaken in connection with the relief of famine, a task which, as the right hon. Gentleman is aware, is distinct from that to which the money raised by subscription is applied. As to the financial resources of the Government of India, I may state that we have in this country an untouched borrowing power of £9,000,000, a portion of which I propose to utilise next month.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether medical authorities in India have condemned the practice of collecting together people seeking famine relief in large camps which are specially liable to attacks of epidemic disease, instead of dis tributing them near their own homes; whether Mr. Monteath, Chief Secretary to Government, has reported that it is undoubtedly true that there is not sufficient establishment in India to deal adequately with the demands for relief, and that it is not supposed that the rules and orders of Government are perfectly carried out; and whether the India Office still considers that the resources of India are sufficient to deal with the famine.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I desire to ask a supplementary question, as the noble Lord has not really answered the question I put to him. I asked him whether there was to be a grant from the Imperial to the Indian Exchequer, and the noble Lord, in reply, said they were going to add to the Indian National Debt in order to avoid such a grant. I cannot conceive that that was his meaning, and I will therefore ask him if no grant is to be made from the Imperial Exchequer until the borrowing power of nine millions sterling is exhausted.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I pointed out that the Indian Government have in this country borrowing powers to the extent of £9,000,000. Any grant made by the Imperial Government towards India must be made by loan, and therefore I assumed my right hon. friend would gather that it was only reasonable that the Indian Government should try to realise its own resources before it came to Parliament. I have over and over again informed the House that if assistance is needed it will be granted.

MR. MACLEAN: Does the noble Lord say that the Viceroy of India does not use the resources at his disposal for the relief of the famine, though the people are dying by thousands?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I did not say anything of the kind. In reply to the question of the hon. Gentleman on the Paper, I have to say that I am not aware that the opinion of medical authorities in India is against large relief works. It is, of course, obvious that there are some disadvantages in collecting the sufferers from famine in large camps, but the system is, on the whole, working well and appears to be the only one under which relief on a large scale can be effectively supervised. I have no knowledge of any such report as that which is attributed in the question to a secretary of the Bombay Government. I have reason to believe that, although there must be much misery and distress connected with so unparalleled a drought, the resources of the Indian Government, as matters now stand, are equal to the task undertaken by that Government in respect of the famine.

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): The noble Lord has said it would be impossible to grant aid without having recourse to a loan, but would it not be possible in view of the exigencies of the famine to remit to the Indian Government for this year or for a given number of years certain annual payment made for military and other services by the Indian Government to the Home Government.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is an entirely new question.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—CAPTURE OF TA-KU FORTS—AFFAIRS ON THE YANG-TSZE.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether arrangement has been made to supplement the forces on the Yang-tsze; and whether any intimation has been conveyed to the Viceroys of the Yang-tsze region that they will be held personally responsible for any injury to the lives and property of British subjects.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will also say whether he has any further information as to the general position in China.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Admiralty have made arrangements for stationing additional ships at the most important ports on the Yang-tsze. Her Majesty's ships will, if necessary, co-operate with the Viceroys on the Yang-tsze in the maintenance of order. No circumstances have at present arisen on the Yang-tsze making further action necessary. The latest information we have received as to the general position of affairs in China is the following telegram from Commanding Officer, Her

Majesty's ship "Endymion," Wei-hai-wei, 18th June, 1900, 8.30 p.m.

> "After six hours' engagement on the 17th June, Ta-ku forts (which fired on the ships of the allied squadron) were silenced and occupied by the allied forces. On the previous afternoon additional men for storming forts were sent inshore from the ships. The British ships up the river engaged were 'Algerine,' sloop; 'Fame' and 'Whiting,' torpedo-boat destroyers; two latter captured four Chinese torpedo-boat destroyers. Casualties—'Algerine,' slight. Storming party and others unknown. Allied Admirals detained Chinese second-class cruiser flying Admiral's flag outside Ta-ku. No information of Commander-in-Chief China's return to Tientsin Bay had been received by the Rear-Admiral by 2 p.m. 17th June."

This information is later than that we received yesterday by Japanese gunboat.

BRITISH SUBJECTS AT PEKING.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can communicate to the House any information relating to the safety of British subjects at Peking.

*MR. BRODRICK: We have no news from Peking of later date than that already communicated to the House.

INDIAN TROOPS DESPATCHED TO CHINA—EXPENSES.

MR. BUCHANAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the expenses, ordinary and extraordinary, of the Indian troops being despatched to Hong Kong and China will be borne entirely by the Imperial Government.

LORD G. HAMILTON: All expenses, ordinary and extraordinary, of any Indian troops who may be despatched to Hong Kong and China will be borne entirely by the Imperial Government.

ASHANTI—NATIVE RISING—INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is able to communicate to the House the names of the European officials, traders, and missionaries now besieged in Coomassie, and the latest reports received as to the health and position of the garrison.

*MR. BRODRICK: In the absence of my right hon. friend, perhaps I may be allowed to read his reply. The Europeans in Coomassie, so far as the names are known, are Sir Frederic and Lady Hodgson, Major Morris, Captains Marshall, Digan, Aplin, Armitage, Parmeter, Bishop, Leggett, Cochrane, and Read, Lieutenant Berthon, Mr. Ralph, Doctors Garland, Tweedy, Chalmers, Graham, Hay, and Macfarlane, Mr. Ramseyer, and five other missionaries whose names are not known. The latest information is contained in a letter from the Governor, dated the 4th of June, in which he said that the state of health was good.

BRITISH SOUTH COAST FISHERIES AND FOREIGN TRAWLERS.

SIR CAMERON GULL (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, having regard to the complaints of fishermen in the Channel and on the South Coast of damage to their gear caused by foreign trawlers, Her Majesty's Government would consider in conjunction with foreign Governments the advisability of the extension of the principles of the North Sea Convention to those areas.

*MR. BRODRICK: Representations have already been made to the Belgian Government in connection with the recent cases of damage to the gear of British fishermen off the South Coast. It is doubtful, however, whether the provisions of the North Sea Fisheries Convention would afford a complete remedy in these particular cases. When the result of the representations which have been made has been ascertained, Her Majesty's Government will further consider the matter.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will the right hon. Gentleman make representations to the French Government, which is much more largely concerned?

[No answer was given.]

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK ACCOUNTS.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, if he can give the approximate amount standing to the credit of deposit accounts in the Post Office Savings Bank on which no operation has taken place for more than ten years.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I fear I cannot give the information asked for. It could only be supplied by a detailed examination of the depositors' accounts, which number over eight millions; and I do not see that any result would be obtained which would justify the labour and expense of such an examination.

POST OFFICE AND TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS ADMINISTRATION.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state what the profit or loss to the Treasury has been since 1861 from operations in connection with the Post Office Savings Bank. I beg also to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can say what the profit or loss to the Treasury has been since 1880 from operations in connection with the Trustee Savings Banks.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I will answer these questions together, as I agree with Sir Stafford Northcote's observations in 1877, to the effect that the subject must be considered as a whole. The net profit in respect of the Post Office Savings Banks cannot be given for any earlier year than 1876 as the income and capital accounts were not separated—but since 1876 it has been £1,565,000. The net loss in respect of the income of Trustee Banks since 1880 has been £197,000, to which should be added the charge on public funds in the same period for making good previous deficiencies of capital amounting to £1,590,000—making a total of £1,787,000. Therefore the cost of the Trustee Banks since 1880 has exceeded the profit derived from the Post Office Banks by £222,000.

EDINBURGH POST OFFICE—REVISION OF DUTIES.

MR. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, when the scheme of revision of the sorting branch of the Edinburgh Post Office, which has been under consideration for about two years, is likely to be sanctioned, and if he would say what has been the cause of the delay.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The scheme is at present under the consideration of the Treasury. As explained to the Hon. Member on the 8th ult. it involves many details, but, it is hoped, will be decided very shortly.

THE SHERIFFSHIP OF ROSS AND CROMARTY.

SIR CHARLES CAMERON (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that Mr. W. C. Smith, Sheriff of Ross and Cromarty, has announced his intention of complying with a requisition of Aberdeen electors to stand as a candidate for Parliament; if so, whether Mr. Smith has resigned his sheriffship; and, if not, whether there is any precedent for a candidate for Parliamentary honours retaining that judicial office.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The fact is as stated in the first paragraph of the question. Concurrently with the announcement referred to, Mr. Smith dispatched to me at Dover House his resignation for presentation in the proper quarter, but owing to the accident that this happened during the Parliamentary holiday it did not come into my hands for a few days later.

LAND REVENUE RECORDS AND ENROLMENTS OFFICE

MR. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether the Land Revenue Records and Enrolments Office at St. Stephen's House, Victoria Embankment, is a public office, having the custody of public records; and, if so, why all the records and public documents kept therein are not open to public inspection in the same manner as the records are at the Record Office, on payment of proper fees; whether he is aware that the Court Rolls kept at the said Land Revenue Office relating to the manorial properties held by the Crown cannot be inspected by the public without the permission of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Woods and Forests; and, if so, by what statutory power have the latter the right to refuse or allow such inspection; and, whether he will cause immediate inquiry to be made into the matter with a view to the public being allowed inspection and copies of such records on payment of reasonable fees such as are charged at the Record Office.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I have made inquiry into this matter and find that some of the documents in the Land Revenue Record Office are open to public inspection. The rules of that office as to the particular classes of documents so open to inspection are in accordance with an opinion given in 1864 by the Law Officers of the Crown. If any document which it is desired to inspect relates to property under the management of some public department the written consent of such department is required before inspection is allowed. The fees payable for inspection and copies are fixed by the Treasury under 2 and 3 Will. IV., c. 1, s. 22, and are considered reasonable.

HOME OFFICE VOTE—CHIEF INSPECTOR OF FACTORIES' REPORT.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is possible to circulate the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories, with a view to the discussion of the Home Office Vote.

MR. HANBURY: I do not think the Report can be circulated before Thursday morning at the earliest. So far as my present information goes there has been very considerable delay on the part of the printers, for which they will, of course, be asked to account.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Then what course does the Leader of the House intend to take with regard to the Home Office Vote on Friday?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I understand the right hon. Baronet is unwilling to take the discussion——

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I am not unwilling, but other Members may be.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If there is an idea that more time should be given for the study of the Report I will not press the Vote, but will take Votes in Class 2 in lieu thereof.

TREASURE TROVE AT CARDIFF.

MR. MACLEAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury with reference to the discovery at Sully, near Cardiff, of a hoard of gold rings, silver coins, etc., of the Roman period, over which the lord of the manor has renounced his right of treasure trove, whether the Treasury proposes to offer these articles for purchase to the British Museum, or whether it will offer them to the Cardiff Museum, which wishes to acquire the whole collection.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This matter is now under consideration.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed during this session with the Education (Scotland) Bill; and, if so, can he name a day on which the Second Reading will be taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it convenient to supplement the general view I gave yesterday of the business of the House by detailed answers in reference to particular Bills.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What Army Votes is it intended to take to-night? I presume the right hon. Gentleman does not intend to exhaust all the Army Votes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall take the Votes in their order, but will reserve Vote 13 in order that later on in the session there may, if necessary, be an opportunity of further discussing War Office matters. I hope good progress will be made, as it is important in the public interest to get as many Votes as possible.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following fifteen Members in respect of the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill:—Mr. Arnold, Mr. Bond, Mr. Brigg, Mr. Jesse

Collings, Sir John Dillwyn-Llewelyn, Mr. Dewar, Mr. Howell, Mr. Hozier, Mr. Humphreys-Owen, Mr. William Jones, General Laurie, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Maclean, Mr. Herbert Roberts, and Mr. Alfred Thomas.

Mr. WODEHOUSE further reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons on Municipal Trading:—Sir Leonard Lyell; and had appointed in substitution: Sir John Leng.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

SUPPLY [14TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

1. £10,000,000, Transport and Remounts.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I wish to say a few words with reference to our transport system. In the opinion of a good many members of the Committee the present system of obtaining remounts leaves a great deal to be desired, because under that system we get untrained horses, and pay a considerable price for them. Now, I should like to suggest to the War Office that they should adopt the transport system which is in vogue in Austro-Hungary. The system, briefly, is this. In 1866 the Emperor Francis Joseph established ten stud depôts in Hungary and eight in Austria. Stallions of the best quality were purchased and sent to these depôts, and from thence they were sent out at regular intervals to particular centres in order to serve the mares of farmers at nominal prices—say, a few shillings. The only bargain made by the Government with the farmers was that the produce of the mares should be available for the Government at a settled price. That price varied from £16 to £32. It works out at about £25 per horse, the highest price paid for cavalry horses being £32, and for draught horses £22. No horse is bought by the War Office under five years of age. Anyone who has taken an interest in the horsing of our cavalry regiments knows well that, although a regiment may be 350 strong, only about 180 horses can be put into the line on the occasion of a review. The other horses are either young horses which have to be left in barracks to be walked round in circles by recruits, or else they are old and useless horses which are simply kept for drill and other purposes. In our service we are supposed not to buy horses under four years of age, but practically we buy them at three years old, and that is why their services cannot be utilised on these occasions. It is an absolute fact that in our service we retain a great many old horses which ought to have been cast long since. Some years ago the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean called for a Return of the horses over fourteen years of age, and it was found that an extraordinarily large number of these animals were in use. I would suggest to the Government that they should try to establish remount depôts and stud depôts. Ireland is about one of the best horse-breeding countries which can be found in the world. You cannot get better pastures than are to be found in Westmeath and in Tipperary. But unfortunately the Irish farmer cannot afford to buy good stud horses, and so he has to put his mares to cheap stallions, and the result is that the produce is not worth anything like so much as would be the case if the farmers had good stallions. Further than that, the money which should go into the breeders' hands too frequently is pocketed by the middleman. I should like to call attention to the system of reserves which obtains in Austro-Hungary. Out of every 100 horses only fifty are at once taken, and the remaining fifty are lent out in the neighbourhood to the farmers and dealers. The horses are brought up every year for four weeks training, and are examined by Government inspectors every spring. If the horses are looking well, the farmer or dealer gets a small bonus; if not he is fined. At the end of five and a half years for draught horses, and six and a half years for cavalry horses, the farmers and dealers are allowed to retain the animals for their own use. I suggest that is a very cheap way of having a reserve of horses, and I think it will compare very favourably with the system adopted by the English

Government, who take 'bus horses and cab horses, and all sorts of animals, as they have had to do lately. It is false economy to take young horses at the price we pay, because we are not able to utilise them. It is a fact that we retain in the service a great many old horses—relics of antiquity, as many of my hon. friends in this House will be able to confirm—simply for the purpose of economy, and these horses ought to have been cast long ago. The War Office should try to establish remount depôts and stud depôts in Ireland, and if the Government will endeavour to follow the system of reserve of horses which obtains in Austro-Hungary, I believe they will do a good turn to English and Irish farmers, and at the same time secure a good class of horse for the service. I think in the interests of common-sense the Government should take this matter into serious consideration.

*CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I have to move a reduction of this Vote in order to call attention to the immense waste of the taxpayers' money in connection with remounts, brought about mainly by the defective state of the Army Veterinary Department. We have at the present moment in South Africa 150,000 animals, the value of which at a low computation would be something like a quarter of a million sterling, yet all these animals are placed in charge of forty-seven veterinary surgeons. Notwithstanding that some time ago I drew the attention of this House to the fact that this Department was far below its proper standard, and that there was a difficulty in obtaining men——

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is taking exception to the Veterinary Department. That comes under another Vote, and any criticism of the Department should be taken on that Vote and not upon this.

*CAPTAIN NORTON: Am I not in order in referring to the defective management of the Remount Department, and in pointing out that, owing to the deficiency of veterinary surgeons, large numbers of these horses were lost on the voyage out, and more perhaps have been lost in South Africa owing to there being an insufficient number of experienced veterinary surgeons?

*THE CHAIRMAN: This seems to me to be a matter which is relative to the Vote for the Veterinary Department.

*CAPTAIN NORTON: Of course, Sir, I bow to your ruling, and I will raise the point later on.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I wish to support what my hon. friend has said with reference to the general question of remounts. It appears that after all we have a use for our Army, and we therefore require cavalry horses for that Army. So far as I can make out, we have only a proportion of one-third horses to men. That is not the system which was relied upon in past years, for we find that Charles XII. of Sweden adopted a very different plan, with the result that he was able to cover with his cavalry ninety miles a day from day to day. His system was exactly the contrary to that which is in vogue in the British Army for, instead of having fewer horses than men, he had twice as many horses as men. The fact was that he had two horses for each man, whereas the British Army has twice as many troopers as horses. I am conscious that when you have so large a number of horses you have to deal with the difficulty of providing forage, but, after all, that is a transport difficulty with which we need not trouble ourselves. What we want to look at is the mobility of our force, and as far as I can make out the best way of securing that mobility is to have more horses than men. I do not feel at liberty to enter into the details of this matter, but I am bound to say that in our recent purchases we have acted on a very bad system. We wanted a large number of horses for South Africa, and we had to send for them to all the four quarters of the world. We had to send, for instance, to the Argentine Republic, and there we bought, I believe, all the wrong horses. We bought the horses from the plains instead of the hill horses, and assuredly the latter were the proper class of animal to have been purchased for operations in South Africa. I wish to impress upon my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War that the time has arrived when we must buckle to on this question of remounts, and consider whether we cannot adopt some such system as that which exists in Austro-Hungary. That system may not be exactly adequate to our requirements, but I believe it is one that is perfectly well adapted to the needs of this country. Under our present system we buy horses without any opportunity of examining them as to their condition, and the result is we purchase from Jew contractors, who make enormous profits on them, horses which are not fit for our purpose, and which are put on board ship and afterwards die during the sea voyage. This can only be avoided by the adoption of a plan to provide the country with remounts on some such system as has been suggested by my hon. and gallant friend, and I believe that if some such plan were put in force it would be a valuable addition to one of the most important branches of our Army.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I have no intention of posing as an authority on the question of the purchase of horses. The question of remounts for the Army is most complicated, and I am sure that the representatives of the War Office will welcome any suggestion that can be made by those practically acquainted with the breeding of horses, and with horse markets generally in this country and elsewhere. I also cannot vie with the hon. Gentleman opposite in his familiarity with the proceedings of Charles XII. of Sweden, but there is one point to which the hon. Gentleman referred, and to which the hon. and gallant Member for South-east Essex also drew attention, upon which I do know something from my own point of view. They spoke of the system in vogue in Austro-Hungary. Now, I have for years past visited that country, and I should like to point out to my hon. and gallant friend that in those countries they have this great advantage which we do not possess here—namely, that the horses used for agricultural purposes are precisely the class of horses which are required for the cavalry. I have often wondered how the horses used in that country could do the work put upon them in view of the condition of the roads over which they have to pass. But I would like to point out that the horses used for agricultural purposes in this country are of an entirely different character, and are not suitable for cavalry work. I think possibly that will be found to lie at the root of the system in Austro-Hungary. Whether or not the Government of that country encourages the use of this particular class of horse for agricultural purposes I cannot say, but I repeat that there the military authorities have an immense advantage which we in this country would not enjoy.

Colonel WELBY (Taunton): The hon. Member for King's Lynn has referred to the discrepancy between the number of men and the number of horses in the cavalry regiments. But I think the statements in reference to this matter are too often misleading. People are apt to forget that in a cavalry regiment men are employed in other capacities than as troopers. There are the waiters, storesmen, and the clerks. These men are not mounted, and yet they are absolutely necessary for the service of the regiment. They could not attend to horses if they were supplied with them. Many of them, as a matter of fact, do not follow the regiment into the field. Probably the only ones who do are the cooks, who are, of course, necessary. Then in regard to the historical reference indulged in by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, I should very much doubt whether Charles XII. of Sweden troubled himself very much about the way in which his horses were groomed. In this country, however, we make a tremendous point of that, and the commanders of regiments are judged upon that matter. Now, if each man had charge of two horses it would be very difficult for him to attend to them properly. We have to remember that men go into hospital, and that in the winter time they expect to have their furloughs, and I would suggest, after all, that if a man took two horses into the field he would not be able to give much attention to the enemy, especially if the animals were not well trained to stand under fire. I believe that if we insisted upon every man having two horses it would be absolutely impossible to get men to join the cavalry. Undoubtedly, the remount system constitutes a very weak point in our cavalry system, and I would urge that the particulars given in the Estimates should show the exact number of trained and untrained horses, and of those unfitted for the field. I can remember a case in which a certain regiment which had a strength of 420 horses was able to, on one particular occasion, put 400 on parade, and it was admitted to be something wonderful. I think it would be a very great pity indeed to cast all horses over fourteen years or sixteen years of age, because a large number of these horses prove very useful until they reach nineteen years. In regard to the employment of middlemen in the purchase of horses, I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is undesirable to encourage such a practice. Then I come to the suggestion that we should adopt the system of Austro-Hungary in regard to the supply of horses for the Army. That may be a very good plan, but I am not certain that it is suited to the circumstances of this country. It appears to me that the only alternative is for the Government themselves to set up breeding establishments. I am afraid that under our system nearly the whole of our best horses produced in Ireland are taken away by foreign Powers. If foreign nations choose to give a pound or two more, we cannot expect English farmers to do otherwise than sell them to foreigners. The only way to meet the difficulty would be to subsidise the farmers who rear the horses, although I cannot say that I am altogether in favour of adopting that course. Failing this, we must fall back on Government breeding establishments, which seems to be the only alternative. There is one small matter I should like to ask a question about, and it is in reference to the food. We all remember the unfortunate incident that took place at Aldershot, resulting in the loss of the lives of several of our soldiers. A good deal of blame has been thrown upon the commanding officers because upon that day the men had not had a proper midday meal. Supposing that bread and cheese had been allowed upon that occasion, would the transport have been provided? In cavalry regiments this allowance is all right, but I am told that in nearly all the infantry regiments the cart in which the midday meal is carried is provided at the expense of the soldiers by the canteen. If so, it has really been provided for out of the men's own pockets. I think it is a question which really wants to be looked into. If we are to blame commanding officers for anything of this kind, we ought to see that the Government provide everything which is necessary.

*Sir HERBERT MAXWELL (Wigtonshire): As a civilian I feel some diffidence in taking part in a debate of so technical a nature, and I will not detain the Committee for many minutes. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, has given very fairly the reason for not relying upon any good results from the adoption of the Austro-Hungarian system by this country. Everyone must recognise the truth of what he said as to the general character of our agricultural horses. I hardly agree with my hon. and gallant friend who has just sat down that we should rely entirely upon supplying our remounts within the limit of these islands, for we can only do so if the Government undertake large breeding establishments. That is the only way in which the supply can be made regular, sufficient, and of proper quality.

Colonel WELBY: I suggested the subsidising of farmers as well as breeding establishments.

*Sir HERBERT MAXWELL: I have no doubt the farmers will offer no objection to the subsidy suggested, but I doubt whether the supply from that source will be rendered uniform or regular enough even by the application of subsidies. What I want to ask my right hon. friend to consider is this: We pay some penalty for living in an island; it has many advantages, but we have some corresponding disabilities, and among them is the impossibility of producing horses on valuable land at a reasonable price. I want my hon. friend to consider whether there are not within the limits of this Empire vast areas not only capable of turning out horses of the best quality, but which do at the present time turn out such horses. Of Australian horses I know nothing, but of Canadian horses I have had some experience. One of the best hunters I ever had in my life was a Canadian horse. I would ask my hon. friend if he is acquainted with the quality of the horses which are imported into this country in large quantities by some of our large corporations for tramway purposes? Take Glasgow, for instance. These horses are sound, of good constitution, good-looking, and quite well bred enough for the purpose. Apparently the supply is unlimited, although I cannot quote the average price now; but I know that the price a few years ago was exceedingly moderate. I am unable to answer the problem propounded by my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn (Mr. Bowles) — namely, how a good supply of horses could be secured for this country without crossing the sea. Of course, they must cross the sea, and some means must be found of keeping up a regular supply. Wherever these horses have to be used they must cross the sea, and all I have to ask my hon. friend is to consider the enormous resources of a country like Canada for supplying horses of the quality required.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I desire to thank all those hon. Members who have taken part in this discussion up to the present for the spirit in which they have approached these questions. I quite recognise that we are now discussing very important matters, but if I may be allowed to make one appeal it is that we should get through our work as fast as possible this afternoon, because this money is actually wanted at once. Therefore it is of great importance that the money should be voted to-day, as there is absolute need of the money for the war. I believe that we can thresh out all the details if we address ourselves to the debate in the same spirit which has characterised the speeches of hon. Members so far. I think the right hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire put his finger on the consideration which underlies all this controversy when he reminded the House that we live in an island. Those responsible for the provision of horses in Austria and France know with great accuracy where and under what conditions the cavalry of their army may be expected to fight. But who could say where the cavalry of England might have to fight? Let me ask hon. Members of this Committee to reflect on what has taken place during the present war. I will give a few figures as a starting point to this discussion. During the course of the present war we have shipped to South Africa altogether up to the 12th of June 91,600 horses. The number of horses shipped to South Africa excludes altogether the number that has been purchased there. Would anybody, on the ground of common-sense or economy, or on the grounds urged by the Member for South-east Essex, ask any Government to maintain an expensive remount establishment and a stud in England, which is the most expensive country in the world, with the prospect of taking the horses so reared a long sea journey at a cost of £35 per horse, as against the very much lower rate charged for horses from Argentina, Australia, Canada, and elsewhere? That lies at the bottom of the whole economic argument, and although I do not press the economic argument too far in this House—I have always been prepared to say that we ought to spend our money to get a good article—still there are limits, and when we find that the sea transport of horses from this country costs more than the horses themselves delivered free from other parts of the world, I doubt whether we should be justified in raising horses in this country to meet the needs of a great war. That consideration must underlie all our purchases. I know very well the great studs at Saumur, in France, and for my part I should be delighted to see such establishments in this country. There these establishments are arranged with 1,700 horses always standing together with their veterinary departments attached, and with different breeds of horses, including the English thoroughbred. I should be delighted if we had in this country such an establishment, but I could never honestly recommend it to the Committee of this House, knowing that horses raised in that manner in this country would cost infinitely more than our horses now cost, and they might also prove to be totally unfit for the various physical conditions of the country to which they might be sent. Of the 91,600 horses shipped to South Africa a certain number of them were sent from this country; others were sent from Canada, from Australia, India, and from other sources which, following the example of my hon. friend, I do not care to name. The Australian horses have cost us, delivered on the beach in South Africa, £45 each; the Argentine horses cost, delivered on the beach in South Africa, £26 each. But the mere passage of a horse from England to South Africa costs £35, and we cannot get the English horse, even under the conditions which now prevail, for less than £35 or £40; so that the total cost of the English horse delivered on the beach in South Africa is from £70 to £75. If you consider the colossal losses which must fall upon the horses in any campaign; if you consider that, after all, the cobs of 14-2 hands which you buy in Argentina or Australia will do your work, and serve your purpose under the conditions of modern warfare just as well as the expensive English horse—for as food for powder one horse is as good to die as another—should I be justified in asking this Committee to pay three times as much as is necessary for an article which is so perishable? That is my answer on the ground of economy. We do not know beforehand the physical conditions of the country in which our cavalry will have to fight, and it is just as well to keep our hands free to purchase horses suited for a particular campaign, and which can be conveyed to the theatre of war most expeditiously and in reasonable numbers. It is not true that the War Office has proceeded in a hugger-mugger way with regard to the provision of remounts. There are officers who have been chosen because of their acquaintance with horses. Officers have been out since July last, not purchasing, but marking down all the good horses in the market and getting options for purchase. That we believe to be a common-sense and an economical plan. Our greatest difficulty in the cavalry springs from the enormous amount of work which the young recruit has to do. We have been going into that very urgent and somewhat melancholy question—namely, the great number of men who have purchased their discharges shortly after joining the Army. Inquiries have been made in Ireland as to the men who have purchased their discharges, and the overwhelming majority of the replies were to the effect that the men liked the cavalry, but did not like the amount of stable duty that had to be done. It has been suggested that there should be two horses for every man, but conceive a regiment in which there were two horses to every man. After each man had done duty as a soldier, and all the necessary work falling on an individual in a community, he would then have to buckle to in order to do the work of a helper. I do not suppose there is any stable in which a helper would be required to mind more than two horses; but after looking after two horses the cavalryman would have to clean his clothes and perhaps have to take part in a field day. The suggestion is absolutely impossible and out of the question. Again, many horses must be purchased more or less after the war comes on, and why, therefore, should we have in a cavalry regiment more horses than we need, in order to mount the men for the fullest parade or field day? Where is the sense and where is the economy? The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Taunton says we do not mark off the young horses from the old; but every hon. Member who has spoken on the subject, and who has taken an intelligent interest—as so many hon. Gentlemen do—in this question knows all the facts. I admit the facts, and I maintain that they are reasonable, and that the system which prevails is the best and cheapest system. It has also been asked whether the Department has considered other portions of the Empire. The Department has considered that question, and I admit to very great personal disappointment when I discovered that two or three year old horses bred or bought in South Africa, and raised there for use in South Africa, would possibly cost more than if we had been able to import them. Nothing is more expensive than keeping horses, and to buy a horse that is not going to be used for two years is one of the most expensive things in the world. That is my answer to the attack which has been made on the Department for purchasing through middlemen. When we purchase from middlemen no doubt we pay more than if we purchased direct, but the middleman has taken the risk of buying the horses subject to illness or accident, and he gives us a finished article and derives a legitimate profit. It is not the case, however, that the Department purchases horses only from middlemen. I was present myself when a gentleman representing the War Office bought four horses from farmers who had bred them. We have experts all over the country who are in touch with sellers of the horses best suited for cavalry purposes, and I do not think it is possible to mount our men in time of peace on any other principle than that which has guided the War Office during the last twelve months.

Mr. WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I do not wish to prolong this debate in any way, and I agree with most of the things that have been said during the discussion. There is one point, however, connected with the Vote which I do not think has been taken into consideration, and that is the question of remounts not only for the cavalry but also for the artillery and transport. These are heavy horses, and I wish to press on the War Office authorities the necessity of having lighter carts than the usual regimental transport is supplied with. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Taunton has touched upon what happened at Aldershot. The enormous difficulty of supplying transport for purposes such as taking provisions into the field would be lessened if there were lighter carts, which would also be better for the horses. There is a great waste of horseflesh under the present system of heavy wagons now used. When these heavy wagons were taken to South Africa it was found that they were not as useful as the smaller and lighter carts. I think some system of lighter carts ought, therefore, to be considered at an early date for all light purposes, both regimental and transport. There was the case of New Zealand offering carts to the War Office. The War Office replied that they would be delighted to accept them, but that first of all they should be sent to Woolwich to be inspected. Of course, the New Zealand Government did not send the carts to Woolwich because, possibly, they would have been returned. There is one other question I should like to put, and that has reference to registered horses. I should like to know what number has been taken, and whether the system has proved to be a success. I should like to hear the War Office opinion on that subject, because it is one of con-considerable importance. I would wish to know whether it has really been put into practice to the greatest possible extent, or if only 100 horses have been taken out of say every 1,000 registered. There is also an item in this Vote for expenses for the removal of troops at home. I hope that as little money as possible will be spent in this direction during the present expensive year. I find the case of a Scotch regiment of Militia which was sent to Glasgow, then to Aldershot, then back to Glasgow again, and afterwards to Ireland. That seems a very great waste of money, and I hope that as few such cases will take place as possible. Of course, it is necessary to send regiments into camp for training, especially regiments recently embodied; but I hope that great economy will be practised in the removal of regiments during the present expensive year.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I should not like this Vote to pass without acknowledging the enormous services which have been rendered by the transport department in South Africa, and also the services rendered by the War Office and the Admiralty in conveying troops, horses, and stores to the seat of war. The country is enormously indebted to the Army Service Corps for the extraordinary loyalty with which they carried out the transport reorganisation in January last. It was very trying to many of the officers concerned, and it is to their great loyalty and hard work that a great deal of the success of the campaign is due. There is a very strong feeling among officers of all arms that the regimental and brigade system of transport inaugurated by Sir Redvers Buller, and for which we are mainly indebted to him, should not be abandoned in favour of the old general system of transport under which regimental officers were enabled to get what they wanted and when they wanted it. Although it was necessary for Lord Kitchener to institute the system at present in force in South Africa, the feeling is general throughout all arms that the regimental and brigade system should not be abandoned. It has been productive of very great benefit, and it would be extremely unpopular if any permanent change were effected. A great deal has been said as to the cavalry remounts. I visited most of our remount establishments in South Africa, and I can fully bear out what the Under Secretary has said regarding the ability shown by the officers selected to purchase horses for the army. It is perfectly extraordinary that such an enormous number of horses as 91,600 should have been landed in South Africa with so few accidents. I wish I could say that English horses had proved more suitable than Canadian, Australian, or Argentine horses, but I must endorse the view which has been expressed by my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War. The English horses were as a rule too big, and they suffered dreadfully in the voyage out, first from the rough sea in the Bay of Biscay, then from the great heat in the Tropics, and again from the change of climate when nearing Cape Town. Another thing which militated against them was the system of docking their tails which prevails in this country, though not in Australia, Canada, or the Argentine. A great deal of the mortality among the English horses was due to the enormous suffering they endured because they had nothing to protect themselves against the pest of flies. One of the criticisms heard in South Africa against our administration was that there was too much grooming and curry-combing of cavalry horses, which prevented them from being protected by the natural oil in their coats from the plague of flies, which no one can understand who has not seen it. The horses sent from this country in many cases suffered severely when there was a bad voyage, and in some cases, though I will not mention names, slings were not provided. Certainly the only horses which I saw arrive in decent condition at the remount establishments in South Africa were those of the C.I.V. Artillery. They had been exercised on board for twenty minutes twice a day, but of course that could not be done on smaller vessels. The Argentine horses have been very successful indeed. They have been of the right size. I think one of the great lessons which this campaign has taught us is that big horses which are difficult to mount are quite unsuitable for mounted infantry. These ought to be furnished with smallish horses, which are easy to mount. With big horses when an enemy suddenly appears the men have difficulty in getting on horseback, and the saddles frequently slip round. Not a few of the casualties in killed and wounded in this war have been due to the excessive size of the cavalry horses. The Canadian horses have also done exceedingly well, and in some respects the Australian—but by no means all. They are frequently much too big. The 14.2 horses from the Argentine and the 15 hand horses from Canada have been invaluable. I wish to say one word in regard to home transport. If anyone sees a regiment move at home he must be struck with the enormous amount of baggage which is necessary, and how much its mobility is thereby reduced. When I was in the Army I thought it quite easy to increase regimental mobility, if the Government would only furnish the officers' quarters, and charge them with a rent. Of course, officers might add, at their pleasure and own cost, to the furnishings afterwards. I think officers are entitled to six hundredweight, but that amount is invariably exceeded, and an entire train is often required to carry the officers' furniture. They must have it, because they have to go into rooms absolutely unfurnished, with no beds, no furniture, no curtains, and if they do not take furniture with them they would have nothing but the bare boards to sleep upon. I most earnestly urge upon my hon. friend, who is anxious to do everything that he possibly can in the direction of improvement, to consider whether the efficiency of the Army as a whole, and its mobility and capability of moving from one garrison to another, might be increased by furnishing officers' quarters, mess premises, and canteens. I believe that, apart from first expenditure, the Department would make a profit on it; at any rate they would pay a very decent interest on the outlay. The object of the Goverment ought to be to make the Army as efficient as it possibly can be made. The hon. Member the Under Secretary for War knows perfectly well that when it is a question with the Horse Guards or the Quartermaster General's Department about the moving of a regiment from this station to that, it is not always the need of the service which is considered. They say, "We cannot move this regiment so soon. Just look at the expense that the officers were put to in moving so recently; and it is not right to make them incur that expense so soon again." In connection with this matter there is the case of the married men, especially the non-commissioned officers and men of the Household Brigade. The cavalry regiments of the Household Brigade move every six months, and these unfortunate people have to pack up their furniture and move from Knightsbridge to Albany Street, and from Albany Street to Windsor. We all know that if we move furniture at all—I do not say there is a leakage on every occasion, but there is a breakage. Things go wrong, and it must necessarily be so in a greater degree in the case of the married men in a regiment of the Army, who are not able to superintend the packing of their luggage, or of necessity have to do it in a rough and ready way. If it is necessary to move a cavalry regiment of the Household Brigade once in six months from one barrack to another, or from one station to another, or across the street, I earnestly entreat my hon. friend the Under Secretary of State for War to endeavour to do something to furnish the married quarters, something for the mess premises, something for the canteens, and something for the officers' quarters. If he does so he will do a great deal to increase the efficiency of the Army and the comfort of the officers and men.

*CAPTAIN NORTON: I wish to say a few words in reference to the transport. I believe every word that has fallen from the Under Secretary of State in reference to remounts. It is quite clear to those who have considered most the conditions of modern warfare, that we should take the nearest and handiest supply of horses when the occasion arises. It would be absolutely impossible to have stud establishments in this country sufficient to supply such a demand as has been made recently. But that brings into greater prominence than ever the necessity for perfecting our system of transport with reference to horses. Previous to the case of the ship "Rapidan" there was no veterinary officer on the Board of Selection for Transports. I am aware that that has since been remedied. I only deal with the point incidentally in order to show the necessity for having proper veterinary officers on board ship to prevent the loss of horses during transport by sea, which is much too great at present. The "Devonia" was sent out to Naples to take mules to South Africa. A veterinary officer was in charge who is now the second senior officer in the Army Veterinary Department in South Africa and a thoroughly competent man. That officer superintended during the voyage the fitting of the ship for the embarkation of the cargo of mules, but no sooner was that done than the mules were placed in the charge of a subaltern who had been sent out to Naples overland. If an illustration was wanted of the necessity for giving veterinary officers the staff rank that they demand, that is one.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is going back upon the ruling which I gave a short time ago.

*CAPTAIN NORTON: I am merely showing the necessity of putting veterinary officers in charge of the transport of horses and mules at sea. If that is not done a large number of remounts are lost, and the country put to great expense. On the 7th June the "Lake Erie" left London with 350 remounts, and there also a Militia officer had been put in charge of the horses, while the veterinary officer was only held in a minor degree responsible for the health and welfare of the horses. I hope the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for War will see the necessity of giving some status to the Army Veterinary Department, in order that the horses during transport at sea to the seat of war may be better cared for than at the present time.

GENERAL RUSSELL (Cheltenham) said he had visited all the remount establishments in Germany, and had also had the advantage of taking part in two campaigns in South Africa. He therefore could say that no matter what our remount system might have been in this country it would have been wholly impossible for the Government in the present crisis to furnish remounts for the cavalry and mounted infantry in South Africa without having recourse to foreign horses. He could also bear out what the hon. Member for Sheffield had said, that both in the Zulu war and the Transvaal war English horses were found wholly unsuitable. They were unaccustomed to the forage, and became skeletons in a short time after they reached South Africa, and the saddles turned round. In every way foreign horses were much more suitable than English horses. The hon. Member for South-east Essex spoke of having remount depôts in this country, but the expense would be ruinous. It had been carefully calculated that if the Government started remount establishments in this country each horse would cost over £80. The German system was entirely different from what we could possibly carry out here. In Germany a large number of stallions belonging to the Government went about the country, and the Government had the first call on the produce, the foals being all marked. Then the young horses were sent to farms for two years before being drafted into the army. That was a very expensive system, and it would be perfectly ruinous if we were to start stud farms in this country. It was almost impossible to buy horses in this country after they exceeded the age of three or four years, and horses when bought at three years old were not fit to put into the ranks. He suggested to the Under Secretary that there should be a certain number of farms in Ireland where the horses could be sent and kept until they had attained the requisite age. When he was in command of a regiment the commanding officers had to buy all their horses, but in his opinion the present system of remounts worked exceedingly well. He supported the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for War in his remarks, and believed the present system was the best that could be devised.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfar) said he rose for the purpose of asking two questions of the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote, the first of which was as to the price of horses. The Under Secretary had stated on a previous occasion that the cost of a horse from Argentina landed at the Cape was £26, while the cost of transport of a horse from this country, excluding the cost of the animal, was £35. That seemed to him a very great difference having regard to the mileage between Argentina and the Cape and London and the Cape. He would be glad of some further explanation on the point. He would also like to know why the first instalment, at any rate, of the Return with regard to transports, which was agreed to by the House as far back as 6th February, had not yet been presented.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said that, as far as he could gather, it was the general opinion of experts that the kind of horse sent to South Africa from this country had not proved adequate to the needs of South Africa. He believed, however, that if the breeders in this country knew what kind of horse was required they would be able to produce it. It was not impossible to breed a stamp of horse with greater stamina, of a coarser kind, to meet the requirements of the Army. He suggested that the Government should send round to the agricultural shows one or two typical animals so that breeders might see what was required. If that were done they would get a cobbier and more bony animal with less blood, which would be more satisfactory. He wished also, in support of the remarks of the hon. Member for Sheffield, to call attention to the matter of regimental baggage. The officers had now to carry about a perfect mass of luggage and furniture because, when they were moved from station to station, the barracks were handed over to them as bare as a cell in a prison. It would, he was sure, be more economical if the barrack rooms were kept decently equipped, and the outlay might be met by charging the officers of each regiment occupying the barracks a reasonable rent. Young officers naturally desired to have as good furniture as their comrades, and went to very great expense in this matter, and he was of opinion if the item of barrack furniture were struck off it would lessen greatly the burden of expense cast on young men joining the Army.

MR. WARNER asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would give some explanation as to how far the War Office had been able to supply the Royal Reserve regiments with horses.

COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) was of opinion that horses purchased for the Army at the present time were taken at too young an age. Every horse purchased should be fit for immediate use, which was very far from being the case under the present system.

*GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) said the suggestion made that horses should be purchased in Canada, where the horse used by the farmer was just the horse required for military purposes, owing to the method adopted had not produced good results. He had had some experience of Canada and the methods adopted there. He knew the difficulty of getting horses in England, but the methods adopted in Canada had not been such as would give the best Canadian horse to the British Army. In Canada the remount officers gave notice of their intention to visit a certain place, with the result that the American dealers also attended, and directly a horse was passed as suitable the remount officers were always outbid by the American horsedealer. He suggested that remount officers should not be sent out in this way, but that the horses should be obtained from the producer through a middleman.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member for Lichfield asked whether the Government were considering the advisability of using lighter carts. Yes, Sir; our experience in South Africa has shown us that lighter carts are necessary, and we are now replacing the present cart by a lighter one. With regard to the question as to the horses, I have not by me the exact number of registered horses, but the omnibus horse is a registered horse, and hon. Members will be glad to hear that he has been twice mentioned in despatches. General Sir George Forestier-Walker stated on 13th March, in reply to inquiries, that the Australian cavalry horse and the English omnibus horse were most satisfactory, and in reply to more detailed inquiries he placed horses in the following order of suitability:—Cavalry horses, the large horses—Australian first, English second, best Argentine third; mounted infantry, cobs—Cape horses first, Indian and Australian second, Argentine third. He also stated that a few Arab horses from India had proved very satisfactory, as well as the English omnibus horse.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Might I ask if a similar report has been received from the front? I take it that report came from the base.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reports sent from the base are reports which come from the front. We get all our reports through the base. Referring to the remarks of the hon. Member for the Lichfield Division, this year, particularly, it has been necessary to place the troops in close proximity to rifle ranges, and I believe great satisfaction has been given to the Auxiliary forces in camp by the fact that they have had no difficulty in that matter. But there is another reason, and, of course, it is also familiar to the hon. Member—namely, that our barracks are only suited to hold regiments of a certain size. The hon. Member asks as to the number of horses already in possession of the Royal Reserve regiments. I have not got the figures with me. I may say, however, that from all these questions it appears that hon. Members do not quite appreciate the fact that these are very young regiments, and that you cannot supply horses until the men are there to groom them. But the average number of men in these regiments is satisfactory, and there is no difficulty in getting horses now as fast as they are needed. I am personally gratified to find that it is possible in this country to get so many horses of the very stamp we need for about £35. My hon. and gallant friend raised an interesting question in regard to the best mode of transport for horses. I do not think I quite agree with him. He referred to the abolition of slings for horses. It is a matter quite open to argument, but the evidence of the recent operations on the sea is not conclusive either way. There have been two bad accidents entailing grievous losses. The accident happened in one case on a vessel fitted on the new model, and the other on a vessel where the fittings were on the old model. It is for the jury to decide, but the change from the slings to the new fittings has been made in view of the practice of the great trading firms who carry an enormous number of horses every year from Argentina, or Australia, to the markets here. They have found that the statistics of losses prove conclusively that the new style of fittings, which allow the horses room fore and aft, are on the whole the best. It has been found that with slings horses are apt to sit down in rough weather for several days together without raising themselves on their hind legs, and that induces serious results. As to the question of baggage that has been raised by the hon. Member for Sheffield and the hon. and gallant Member for the Newport Division, I sympathise very much with the view which they have put forward. I thought my hon. and gallant friend in raising the question, by importing the word "mobility" into his plea, might mislead those who are not closely following the discussion into thinking that we are not attending to mobility for the purposes of war. Of course, that is a totally different thing. This is a plea put in on behalf of the British officer that he should not be put to so great expense as he is at present by being asked to fit up a room from floor to ceiling and then to convey the whole of his goods and chattels at each of the many removals entailed upon him. I am glad that the question has been raised, because some remarks which I let fall earlier in the session upon the urgent need of reducing the cost to his parents of the young officer have been held outside this House to mean that the young officer is as a rule extravagant. I do not think that that is the case. He may be in certain cases extravagant. There may be room for a certain amount of, I shall not say sumptuary legislation, but sumptuary pressure, but in my opinion it must be accompanied by some relief of the burdens which we place upon him. It is not fair to say to the young officer, "You are not to waste your money in this way," and at the same time to force him to devote so large an amount of his private funds to buying his bed, poker, and fender.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: The poker and fender are provided.

Mr. WYNDHAM: If we are to have a reform, I think it ought to be a bilateral reform. With the need for sumptuary reform there is a need for greater generosity towards the young officer, who has so many charges placed upon him.

*Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): The hon. Gentleman has stated that he can get as many horses as he wants. I know a cavalry regiment which has only 200 horses, and I know for a certainty that there are many men in that regiment who were never on a horse. There must be something radically wrong. Why, there are cavalry regiments where there are about three men to every horse. One hon. Gentleman has said that we ought to have two horses to every man. Most of the cavalry officers would be very glad if every man had his horse. There are regiments where recruits are absolutely unable to get a mount at all. If the horses can be got, why are they not got? As to the suggestion that farmers should be subsidised on condition that they sell their three-year-olds at £30, I should be sorry to see that introduced, as the price would be too low for the pick of the young horses. In regard to the supply of horses there is no doubt that we cannot get the supply we require in England at the prices paid. The Austrian horses to which the hon. Gentleman opposite referred are simply half-bred animals similar to those employed in Ireland, and they can be bred much more cheaply. They are light horses, which are used in farm work, and as hon. Members know these mares can go on working to within a few days of foaling. If farmers were to be subsidised in the way proposed they would have to be much more highly subsidised than in Austria if we are to have the same thing here as in Austria. That would add greatly to the Army Estimates. The farmers could not be expected to breed horses in England at the same prices as in Austria or Ireland. I hope that my hon. friend the Under Secretary of State for War if he can get horses in the unlimited manner he describes will see that the necessary supply is obtained.

Mr. WARNER: There is no difficulty about getting horses, and therefore the remount system is in no way to blame. The difficulty is that the regiments have not got them. It is the supplying of them to the regiments and the application for them that has gone wrong.

Vote agreed to.

2. £13,100,000, Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies.

Colonel WELBY pointed out that the present arrangement in regard to the supply of bread and cheese was not satisfactory. He urged that where the provision of bread and cheese was necessary it should be supplied by the Government instead of being paid out of the money which really belonged to the men. All these little things were talked about throughout the country, and they tended more or less to make the Army unpopular

Mr. WARNER stated that according to the regulations for forage allowances the lieutenant-colonel of a regiment received an allowance for his horse, and so did the major when in England, while the second in command had no allowance.

*Mr. JEFFREYS: I should like to call attention to the way in which food is passed into the various camps. The meat has to be passed by a subaltern, who generally knows absolutely nothing about the subject. How can he possibly know anything about it, seeing he is not trained for such work? The duty requires men who have been specially trained. At present, a subaltern is told off every day to see whether the meat is good or bad, and he naturally does the work as quickly as possible, as he wants to get away to his own business or amusements. That certainly is not a satisfactory way of examining meat. The men sometimes complain that the meat is not good, and we hear a great many complaints as to its insufficiency. There ought to be a radical change in the way this duty is performed; some properly qualified man should be appointed—either a military man or a civilian. Very often a civilian would do better in this matter, but, at any rate, there ought to be some man with special knowledge of the subject to pass all the meat that goes into camp for the use of the troops. I should like to call attention also to the way in which forage is passed. The forage is brought in in wagons, in which form it is passed by a superior officer. Those wagons are taken into the particular camps, where subalterns are told off to look at the oats or the various trusses of hay, and see whether they are good or bad. Again, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the subaltern has no special knowledge of what forage should be. It is quite a joke amongst contractors that subalterns look at the hay and frequently send back good hay and pass bad. Unless somebody who has a far better knowledge of the subject is told off for this duty we shall not get the troops properly foraged. The Government pay a sum of money sufficient to obtain good forage, and they are supposed to get it, but as long as this duty is detailed to subalterns who know nothing about the matter the present state of things will continue. We have heard to-night about the horses having to carry heavy loads. It would be a great deal better for the horses if they had good forage. No horse can work hard on bad forage. These are the two points I desired to bring before my hon. friend. First of all, I would ask him to make a change in the way in which meat for the troops is passed into camp; and, secondly, I would strongly urge him to appoint inspectors with a special knowledge of the subject to pass or reject the forage necessary for the horses.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) drew attention to the large increases in the amount allotted in the Estimates under this Vote for the purpose of sweeping chimneys, and "lime and other contingent expenses." He could understand how the increase with regard to the latter, which was three times the amount of last year, might occur, but he could not see why the amount for sweeping chimneys should be four times the amount of last year.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.): I wish to ask the hon. Gentleman a question with regard to the item, "allowances to wives and children of soldiers when separated from them." There is, first of all, the case, which is a very hard one, and which the War Office has promised to consider, but with regard to which we have not yet had any definite answer, namely, that of the man who has married without leave. My hon. friend is probably aware that the allowance is paid to the wives of all the men who have married with leave, and are on the strength of the regiment. It is also paid to the wives of all Reservists who are called upon to rejoin the colours. The only class who do not receive the separation allowance from the War Office are the wives of the men who have married without leave. Whatever reason there may be during time of peace for not recognising these women as legally married, there can surely be no reason for not doing so when the husbands are away on active service. I think my hon. friend will admit that, whatever may be said as to the necessity of maintaining discipline in the Army, no question of discipline can really enter into consideration when it is a case of the wife of a man serving his country at the front. There is also another point. Some few weeks ago I put a question to the Financial Secretary to the War Office with regard to the payment of separation allowances to the wives of the wounded. I was then informed that the War Office were paying those allowances, but the hon. Member could not say how long that practice was to be continued. I think my hon. friend will admit that it is but fair that those concerned should know whether the War Office intend to continue to pay these allowances, and, if so, for how long. There is one other case I have to bring forward, to which I am sure my hon. friend will listen sympathetically, and I hope he will be able to agree with the view I am going to put before him. I want to ask whether the War Office cannot consider the very hard case of the mothers of many of the Reservists who are called up. I may be told that it is very difficult to draw a line of demarcation, and that you must draw the line at a man's wife. But I do think that the War Office might well consider whether they could not pay to these mothers, if not the same as to the wives, at all events a smaller separation allowance during the time their sons are at the front. When these Reservists are called upon to rejoin the colours it frequently causes the loss of the means of subsistence as far as the mother is concerned, and the War Office might well consider this matter. My hon. friend has been most kind in regard to cases I have brought before him, but I am now referring to the general policy, because when individual cases are brought before the authorities they always say they cannot go outside the instructions which the Secretary of State has given. I therefore hope that my hon. friend will be willing favourably to consider the three points I have brought forward, and assure us that, if not in the case of the present war, at all events should we be unfortunately engaged in any future war these matters will not be overlooked.

*General Sir F. W. FITZ WYGRAM (Hampshire, Fareham) was understood to suggest that all cavalry officers should in every second year of their service be sent for a week or ten days to Aldershot for a thorough instruction in forage at the veterinary school. There is the school, and it ought to be made more useful than it is.

Major RASCH: I should like to say a word with regard to the subalterns passing meat. It is quite true that the subaltern frequently knows very little about it, but the quartermaster who is with him knows a good deal, and the odds are that he knows rather too much. In reference to forage, I think that if the curriculum of young officers who are trying for admission included, instead of the useless nonsense now to be found, the study of a book such as that written by the hon. Baronet below me, on horses and forage—a book which is about the best of its kind that I have read—it would remove much of the ignorance which is sometimes found in officers in regard to hay, oats, and straw. Perhaps I might be permitted to say half a dozen words with reference to the meat ration. Three-quarters of a pound is too little. The addition of a quarter of a pound means—I think it was so stated some time ago—something like a quarter of a million of money per year, but when from three-quarters of a pound of meat you take away the bone and fat—and no soldier with any respect for himself, as everybody knows, will eat fat if he can help it—the ration is brought down to the size of a small sausage, and that really is not enough for a growing man. I have been told that a horse master brought a horse to exist on one straw a day, and I think

the experiment of giving the British soldier three-quarters of a pound of meat—which, when cooked, is rather less than half a pound—is really more or less in the same direction.

Mr. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman can give us any explanation of why practically the whole of the hay which has been used during the present war has been obtained from Argentina or elsewhere abroad. I remember the answer of the Financial Secretary to the War Office, that he could not state the price paid, and also that there were difficulties as to transport and the cost of transport. But I think we should have some explanation of why large sums of money have been expended abroad when it is quite possible that that money might have been spent in this country. I can assure the hon. Gentleman there is a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst farmers in this country, especially in the west of England, with the way in which the Government, to a very large extent, have ignored them in regard to the purchase of hay for our horses in South Africa; and I hope the hon. Gentleman will think it worth while to give us some explanation.

Mr. WYNDHAM: My hon. and gallant friend the Member for Taunton raised the question of the refreshments supplied to the troops, and he took exception to the fact that such provisions had to be paid for out of the canteen accounts. That goes to the root of the whole policy of providing for the soldier, and another part of the same question has been raised by the hon. and gallant Member for South-east Essex, who stated that the meat ration is insufficient. All those who are conversant with the matter know that the ration at home is 1lb. of bread and ¾lb. of meat, which is increased to 1lb. when the troops are under canvas. But in addition to that a clear 3d. has been given for messing, and the canteen system turns upon the way practically in which the soldiers manage and finance for themselves the amount of money which is pooled and which is derived from that source. Many of the hon. Members who have taken part in this discussion have been to Aldershot, and they know the conditions under which the soldiers live. But those hon. Members who have not been to Aldershot have no idea of the amount of money which has been sunk by the public in canteen and recreation rooms. There are theatres for sing-songs and other entertainments; there are rooms for recreation and games, with libraries attached, and the whole of this fabric is earning money for the soldier The officers take a good deal of interest in the conduct of these places, the accounts are audited for nothing, and a great deal of money can be made, thanks to the supplies and assistance which are voted by this House. It is out of the money so made that the soldier provides himself with the meals which are really necessary in view of the ration which is given. I am not prepared to argue whether the change suggested would be better or not, for I prefer to give no opinion upon it; but I am anxious that the system should be thoroughly understood. I think that there is a great deal of misapprehension as to the breakfast of the soldier. The hon. Member for Lichfield asked me a question about the officer in command which it is impossible to follow across the floor of the House. As to the remarks made by the hon. Member for the Basingstoke Division, he contends that every officer in the Army ought to be an expert on the quality of the food supplied to the men and of the forage supplied to the horses, and he advocates the employment of civilian experts.

*MR. JEFFREYS: I said civilians or soldiers.

MR. WYNDHAM: My contention is that every officer in the Army ought to be an expert on the quality of food supplied to his men and the quality of the forage supplied to his horses. I listened with great interest to the speech made by the hon. and gallant Member for the Fareham Division, and I feel sure that in the cavalry regiment with which he was connected any young officer who did not know good forage from bad would have received very short shrift from him. If this is true in regard to forage, it is equally true with regard to food. The point, however, is one of regimental discipline, and I am convinced that in any well administered regiment there is very little room for the abuses suggested by the hon. Member. A good commanding officer would no doubt have his meat properly inspected while a bad commanding officer would probably fail in that respect. The hon. and gallant Baronet has asked why the items rof barrack expenditure have increased so much, and why they are higher than hitherto. The barracks have never been fuller in the history of this century than during the last month, and the greater expense is a necessary consequence. The hon. Member for the South-west Division of Manchester has brought up a question in which he has taken so great an interest, for he has made himself the champion of the dependents of our soldiers who are fighting abroad, and personally I thank him for the interest he has taken in this subject. But as the hon. Member has hinted, it is not possible to alter the basis of the whole system of allowances. The allowance he refers to is given in lieu of rations in the married quarters, and that is why it is given to the wife when the husband is separated from her. The theory that the Government should provide lodging, food, and fuel for all the dependents of our Army is a proposition which we could not entertain. I think my hon. friend will see that it would be extremely difficult for the War Office to undertake what he has indicated. The only other question raised is the one put forward by the hon. Member for South Somerset, who asks why so much hay has been bought out of this country. I do not know whether the hon. Member was present during the debate in regard to the purchase of remounts, but precisely the same principle underlies the purchase of hay which must underlie the purchase of all articles for our Army. We must get the best article at the most moderate price, and it is a fact that you can get hay from Canada and other places which is considered to be the very best forage for this campaign at a price infinitely lower than you can get hay, as a rule in small quantities, from individual farmers in this country. I am sure the hon. Member would be the last person to say that we should use this great emergency as an occasion to benefit one class, and we must regard it as a business transaction.

MR. STRACHEY: Will the hon. Gentleman state what the price per ton was of the hay bought in Argentina?

MR. WYNDHAM: It was very much less than the price of English hay.

MR. STRACHEY: I quite admit the force of what the hon. Gentleman has said, but the Government have repeatedly refused to say what price they have been paying for hay. It has been stated that they have paid as much as £8 or £10 a ton abroad when they could buy the best hay at half that price at home.

MR. JEFFREYS: The statement made by my hon. friend that the cost of English hay would be £4 or £5 a ton more has quite convinced me that the purchases made were the most economical. It is a fact that shipowners do not like to carry hay because it is likely to set on fire. It is also a very bulky article, and the cost of the carriage out there is double what the hay costs here. My hon. friend said that the soldiers ought to be able to tell good forage from bad. The fact is that they do not know how to inspect forage. Perhaps they knew it twenty years ago, but they do not know it now. They are not instructed in it, and they do not inspect the forage in a proper way. I did not advocate that civilians should inspect it, but I said that somebody, either civilians or soldiers, should inspect it, and what I hoped that my hon. friend would say was that he would see that the forage was properly inspected. I think that in this most important duty of inspecting not only meat, but forage, some instruction should be given.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that when the Government of Bombay had to supply the Army in Egypt with enormous quantities of forage, the best forage was found to be that which was purchased in Austria.

COLONEL WELBY said that in regard to the inspection of meat, he had known butchers to differ as to the quality, and one of the best means he knew of obtaining good meat for a regiment was to put the butcher into the water cart.

*GENERAL LAURIE: There is one point which has not been satisfactorily answered by the Under Secretary, it is as to the increase of the meat ration. I am aware that as he stated messing allowance has been given, but that was intended to provide the soldier with an evening meal instead of requiring him to provide it out of his own pocket. The question has become more urgent now than in former times, because then we had a comparatively small number of young recruits in a company composed mostly of grown men. The old soldier did not use all his allowance, so that a surplus went to the young lad, for whom the ration was not sufficient. We are now talking about getting three years soldiers, and that means that we must have more growing lads. If so, then we must give them enough food to make them into healthy and strong men, and the meat rations ought to be increased.

Vote agreed to.

3. £4,680,000, Clothing Establishments and Services.

SIR J. FERGUSSON said he thought that something ought to be said upon this Vote about that great defect which had been so painfully illustrated last week at Aldershot. He alluded to the practice of exercising the soldiers in very hot weather such as they had recently experienced without any proper covering to their head. At Aldershot many soldiers fell out of the ranks, many were taken to the hospital, and a certain number died. It was common knowledge that an enormous number of men fell out of the ranks during the manœuvres last Monday week. Four of the men had died, and his contention was that those lives need not have been lost, and those casualties need not have occurred at all had the men been properly equipped. We were sending men out to drill year after year in the extremely hot sun without any better covering to their heads than that absurd garment known as the forage cap, which some people called "smart." In his opinion the forage cap was a useless and ridiculous head-dress. The forage cap was much too small to keep off the sun, and it had to be worn cocked on one ear. He did not see why the smartness of the British Army should depend upon having a very small hat cocked on one side of the head. The German soldiers and the soldiers of other nations wore hats with a good broad top to keep the sun off their heads, and why the British soldier should be bound to wear a little hat stuck over one ear he could not understand. In India such a thing would not be allowed for a moment, for there they took very good care that the head was covered. He thought that it almost amounted to a crime that soldiers should be sent out on a hot summer day, wearing forage caps, simply to be struck down by sunstroke. He could not conceive why the War Office had not long ago adopted a more sensible cap.

COLONEL WELBY thought the explanation of the wearing of forage caps at Aldershot was to be found in the fact that it was necessary to clearly distinguish the troops during the manœuvres. The soldiers were very much alike, and if they had not worn their forage caps there would have been no distinguishing mark at all. He was perfectly certain that it would be found that the reason the forage caps were worn was simply to enable the forces to be distinguished at some distance from each other. They all knew that at Aldershot things would get terribly mixed up during these manœuvres if all the forces were dressed exactly the same. Allusion had been made to the necessity of providing a proper forage cap. They had had many new forage caps, but none of them were really of any practical service. It was a remarkable thing that they never saw anything designed by the War Office in common use, for they were generally patterns forced upon the soldier. He could not understand why a proper forage cap could not be designed. His own belief was that the one worn by the German soldiers was the most practical. He knew that they did not like to copy other nations, but still there was a great deal to be said in favour of them from a practical point of view. He had been informed that the helmet served out to the troops had proved very unserviceable in South Africa. For one thing, the men could not lie down comfortably wearing it. The only practical head-dress in South Africa was the soft hat worn by the Yeomanry and City of London Volunteers. There were some difficulties in regard to a provision of a practical head-dress, but he hoped the changes to be introduced into the Army, arising out of the experiences obtained in the war, would include the provision of good practical head-dresses which would afford proper protection from the hot sun.

LORD EDWARD MANNERS (Leicestershire, Melton) said he agreed with the remarks of his hon. and gallant friend as to the extremely unsuitable character of the forage cap. The helmet which was issued to the infantry of the Line at home fitted too close to the temples, and had no brim to afford protection to the eyes and the temples from the sun. Besides this the helmets were extremely uncomfortable, and those supplied to the London police were much better and of a more practical shape. He fully endorsed the remarks which had been made by his hon. and gallant friend as to the extremely unsuitable character of the forage cap, and he hoped that steps would be taken to provide the soldiers not only with a good forage cap, but also with a more suitable full-dress head-gear.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I very much question whether the intelligence of the War Office is capable of devising an ordinary rational suit of clothes for the British soldier. The hon. and gallant Gentleman alluded to fashion, and said some caps were not liked because they were not smart enough. Are we to sacrifice everything, even the lives of our soldiers, to fashion? It is perfectly possible to invent a rational head-dress for the British soldier. The British Army is the only one in the world which has not got such a head-dress. Why does not the hon. Gentleman take an example from the Navy? The Navy cap is very much like the cap worn by the German soldier, and there is nothing smarter. Let the hon. Gentleman take courage and put his foot down and override all these questions of taste, smartness, and fashion. I do not know anything more ridiculous than a Guardsman walking about London with a little tin pot perched on one ear. You cannot lie down comfortably in it, and when a man stands up he appears to my mind a semi-idiot. It is the most ludicrous head-gear ever put on the head of a human being. For the undress forage cap the sailor shows the way. He looks smart in it, and there is no reason why a cap of essentially the same pattern in either red or blue cloth should not be given to the soldier. As to the full dress cap, there is the large slouch hat tied up on one side which is used in Australia and South Africa. It is the hat which the Cavaliers wore when they fought the Roundheads, and which the Roundheads wore when they fought the Cavaliers with such vigour and effect. It is essentially an English invention, and if the hon. Gentleman or the Commander-in-Chief wants to add a little millinery to it, there are ostrich feathers, cocks' feathers, gold lace, and buttons, and whatever is done to it, it will not cease to be comfortable and workmanlike. That is the hat for the British Army. Let us go back to the seventeenth century, and take the hat worn by our great-great-grandfathers. As to the forage cap, the sailor's cap is practical and useful. He uses it in all sorts of climates; he does his work in it, and goes aloft in it, and practically it has never been found to fail. It will, therefore, be to the credit of the War Office, now that a number of men have been killed through their incapacity, if they go back to the Navy for a suitable cap, and to the last century for a full dress head-gear.

MR. WYNDHAM: This subject lends itself, no doubt, to humorous treatment. It is easy to be amused over the eccentricities of costume which have been the theme of the satirists of every age, but the subject comes before us to-day because of a most melancholy catastrophe, to which I have alluded once before. I can assure every hon. Member in this Committee that no one feels more deeply than I do how deplorable it is to have to chronicle the deaths of four men at our own doors at Aldershot in addition to the men who are dying day by day in South Africa. The War Office is approaching this subject in all seriousness, and every step has been taken to see that such an occurrence shall not take place again. I would prefer not to go into the question as to the exact distribution of blame between individuals for the death of these four men. No one is more deeply sensible of their loss than those who directly or indirectly may have contributed to the catastrophe. I could adduce a number of reasons to show that although there may have been negligence there had not been what I might call culpable negligence of such a character as to justify this Committee in taking action when action has already been taken. Although it may not appear so to civilians, I think every soldier in the Committee will agree with me that for the Commander-in-Chief to intervene in a divisional command and to publicly notify his regret that certain things had happened and to direct that they shall not occur again is a rebuke of a very practical and severe character, and I may add that the directions sent to Aldershot have been repeated in identical terms to all the other commands where there are numbers of troops in camp. Our duty ought to be to take steps of a practical kind, and not to try and fix blame on this or that individual.

SIR J. FERGUSSON: No one said a word about individuals.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, but I cannot altogether ignore what takes place outside. I think there has been regrettable criticism outside this House on the part of people who, unlike the service Members of this Committee, are not competent to decide who is responsible, and they frequently make grave errors and inflict cruel injustice on deserving officers who are in no way to blame. I now come to the question of the clothing of the British Army. A great deal of criticism has been offered regarding the forage cap. Let us admit it is not a good cap, but my point is that you should not expect a cap to do duty for a hat. I think that it is better that we should concentrate our attention on two forms of head-dress—namely, a cap and a hat, rather than on the question of turning a cap into a hat or a hat into a cap. That has been at the bottom of many of our errors in the past. The cap ought to be worn in the early morning or in the evening when duty is over. Then it is said that it does not protect from the sun, and an attempt is made to make it like the hat. The hat must be of some weight and resistance if it is to be a protection from rain and sun, but then it is said, "It is too heavy; let us try and make it like the cap." What we want is to get either a cap or a hat. When we come to the question of a hat we are face to face with difficulties not entirely connected with fashion or mode. How many head-dresses are there in the British Army? and how many corps are prepared to give up their own head-dress? Will the Scotch Greys give up their bearskins or the Highlanders their bonnets? Then we have busbies, astrachan helmets, Highland bonnets, and different kinds of helmets, and you cannot lay a finger on any one of these articles of head-gear without really damaging the sentimental traditions of some particular corps. It is not a question of mere fashion. I am often amused at some of the criticisms heard on this subject. In one capacity the commonsense critic says, "Why not adopt a plain, sensible head-gear?" but in his other capacity as a proud parent of a young son in a crack corps he asks, "Why destroy the head-dress of that corps which was perhaps worn at Fontenoy or in other battles more than one hundred years ago?" We cannot afford to ignore that altogether. It is part of the capital on which we run our army. It might be said that this or that was a ridiculous hat. So it might be, but it reminds the men who are in the corps at the present day of things which are of great value to them and of great value to the nation in securing troops under the voluntary system. I am not prepared to defend the forage cap, but the cap was not intended, and ought not to be intended, and was not designed as a protection from the sun. The fact of it is, that to wear a cap under a hot sun is a mistake. I am prepared to confess that we have not a full supply of full head-gear for all the troops. I make that confession, and I do not think it reflects in the least on the Department or the Director General. We have sent out an immense number of different kinds of helmets to South Africa, and we can only get a limited number from the manufacturers in this country who are sometimes themselves interfered with by the trades union connected with that manufacture, who object to the use of apprentices, and so on. Our path is full of difficulties. We have sent this enormous number of helmets to South Africa, and the result is that a portion of our forces at home are for the present without helmets. The lesson to be learnt is that we must in future have a far greater reserve of such stores than we ever had before, and that is part of the policy of the Government. Now we are aware of what ought to be done and we intend to do it. As I said we cannot expect from the manufacturers all the head-gear we require for the moment, therefore as an emergency measure we are prepared to at once issue, without prejudice as to what finally the head-dress of the Army ought or will be, 52,000 light canvas slouch hats for the Militia and Royal Reserves which have to be drilled. We can get a large quantity of this class of head-gear, but it is not to be taken as the final form of the slouch hat. Let me put another consideration before the Committee. Many Militia corps are affiliated to Scotch regiments. Are we to supply them with the feather bonnet? Why should we sink an enormous amount of money in that class of head-gear? It costs more than the helmet, though it lasts longer; but who is going to stow them away for eleven months out of twelve, when they should last about 144 years, and become a kind of stud for moths. It will be seen, therefore, that the matter is not so easy as it may seem. We are feeling our way towards securing a suitable head-dress for the whole Army. A smart head-dress, which I would prefer to call the traditional head-dress of the regiment, will be provided for full-dress and holiday occasions to remind the men of the history of their regiments, and, in addition, there will be a workmanlike head-dress to be worn by regiments in any part of the Empire or out of the Empire. On that we have been at work for a long time. Sometimes we have been criticised and laughed at for taking so long at the War Office, but it would be a great mistake and a fatal error to decide on a new head-dress that would not be acceptable to the soldier. That would throw back this reform for years. We cannot force these things on the Army, but the reform can be effected if we secure an article which will be satisfactory, and I hope that that will be obtained without any great delay. We have got to consider tint, texture and weight, and as between tint, texture and weight we have to strike a mean suitable to the climate of this country and South Africa.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Gentleman has in a most interesting and eloquent way laid down certain principles which are very useful to the Committee. The Committee should bear in mind all the difficulties in the way of securing a uniform and practical head-dress for almost every condition in a soldier's career. I think, however, the hon. Gentleman is aiming at too much if he thinks he can find a head-dress which will suit every climate to which the British soldier may be sent. The great difficulty in our Army is that we never know where a soldier may be employed, and under what conditions. As to the question of head-dress, I confess at once that I think that the present difficulty is mainly owing to the slight which was put some years ago by a countryman of mine, on the Glengarry cap. Then the present cap was invented. I am not quite sure whether it was not adopted when I was at the War Office, but I do not think my heart approved of it, even though my hand did. I believe it was the result of long cogitation and experiment, and was supposed to be very successful. There is one point with regard to head-dress which ought to be remembered. A cap is not likely to be very successful if it is not worn on the place where a cap ought to be worn. If a cap is worn on the nose or on the back of the head it is not much good to the top of the head, and I think that the exaggerated angle at which the British soldier is apparently encouraged, for the sake of a smart appearance, to wear his cap, is the cause of many of the evils attributed to the cap itself. I think hon. Members will recognise the difficulties connected with this matter if they consider the great difficulty they themselves experience in finding a suitable head-gear for their own use. The question is not by any means as simple as it looks. There is the ordinary silk hat, of which I am an advocate myself, but I have read columns and columns in the newspapers attacking and defending it, and it is certainly a debatable point whether it is good or not. For the purposes of a more free and easy life the universal practice now is to wear a cloth cap close to the head, which has always seemed to me, although comfortable, to be one of the hottest head-dresses anyone can wear. We change about ourselves from one kind to another, and there is no necessity for uniformity in our case. We have plenty of ingenious people in the shops who provide us with what we want, though I doubt if any hon. Member finds any one of the head-dresses usually sold for use in private life a really good head-dress. Therefore the difficulty connected with finding a suitable head dress for the soldier—who is not so free, and who has more strict conditions imposed upon him—is not at all surprising. An hon. Member spoke, very properly I think, of the necessity of considering the traditions of the Army and those little peculiarities and customs which are commonly associated with great events in the past. No one can attribute anything of that kind to the helmet or cap of the present day. Both are the creations of our own time. Now the hon. Gentleman has told us that the War Office is engaged, and has been for some time engaged, in considering this question. I only hope that he will apply the excellent rule he has laid down to-night. I think the War Office is sure to come to grief in its efforts if it attempts to do too much, or if it thinks that absolute uniformity can be applied to all the circumstances, climates, and conditions under which the British soldier serves.

MR. WARNER: I have worn all these caps, and I think that the worst of them all was the hard cap. The War Office is to blame for not having supplied the Royal Reserve regiments and certain of the Militia regiments with some similar head-dress. The Under Secretary for War has stated that it was impossible to provide a suitable head-dress for all cases, but he might have supplied a head-dress for drilling in the sun. If the troops at Aldershot had had slouch hats the sad accidents that happened there would not have occurred. I want to draw attention to a question which was the subject of a serious debate in another place, where there was a consensus of opinion that the War Office were doing wrong. I allude to the practice of putting Militiamen into old cast clothes. That is not the way to get good recruits for the Militia. It is said that the Militiaman gets one new suit of clothes. That is hardly the case. He gets one which may be new or partly worn, and one that is not fit to be put on; and this he has to wear for years. I hope the War Office will take into serious consideration the subject of giving the Militiamen at least one decent suit of clothes instead of the old worn things which they get at present. It is a perfect disgrace and a hardship to have to put such clothes on, although I believe it is quite true that they have been boiled and cleaned and made wholesome. A similar complaint may be, made against the accoutrements. I saw the other day some what were called valises, which were to a certain extent serviceable, but they did not match the others in the regiment. They had been worn by another regiment, were at least twenty years old, and had been sent down to replace those that were falling to pieces. In the same way worn-out rifles are served out. I hope that some more care will be taken in supplying Militiamen with new clothes, new accoutrements, and new rifles.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I am very glad to hear that the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for War is paying some attention to the clothing of the Army, and that the soldier is to be supplied with one smart suit for full-dress occasions, and another to wear when work is to be done. The Under Secretary speaks of historical uniforms, but I should say that in future sentiment will run in favour of loose tunics which will recall the glorious deeds in South Africa. I am sure that the young ladies would be better pleased to see their sweethearts and brothers dressed with some reasonable relation to the work which they are called upon to do. Reference has been made to the tight tunics and tight stocks of old days which destroyed the soldiers' health. I remember a Committee upstairs which investigated this matter. In those old times the tunics were so tight that the heart was affected, and the soldiers were attacked by diseases which were despaired of by the Army doctors. Since then the clothing of the soldier has been much more sensible, and irritable heart and aneurisms, and all that class of cases directly due to the cramping caused by the tight tunic and stock have almost entirely disappeared. If you give soldiers a sensible dress their health will increase in due proportion. The "man in the street," who is a man of common-sense, has a right to expect that common-sense will direct the movement of troops at Aldershot and other parts of the world. I am glad that my hon. friend has taken a grave view of the sad affair at Aldershot. The serious results of sunstroke are not to be measured by the number of deaths. There are many cases in which the man never says anything about it. But a man who has had sunstroke is never safe; it affects him for the rest of his life; and he is easily upset in a variety of ways, familiar to those who have travelled in tropical climates. When I was about to travel in the tropics twelve years ago, the first thing I did was to go to a friend who had experience and ask him what precautions I ought to take. He said the only danger was from the sun striking the head, and the best thing to do was to put up an umbrella whenever the sun came out. This I did, and I was all right. If men do not put on a proper head-dress when the sun is blazing, they are bound to get sunstroke. I would ask my hon. friend the Under Secretary if he will lay on the Table of the House the results of the full inquiry that has been made into these sad events at Aldershot, of the gravity of which the hon. Gentleman has taken a very proper view. I am sure that that would relieve apprehension and remove misconception.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): My hon. friend seems to lay the entire blame of what happened at Aldershot on the War Office, for the want of sun helmets. I rise merely to say, in one sentence, that I am personally acquainted with certain cases where the regimental officers made a request for sun helmets, and the War Office made no difficulty in supplying sun helmets or slouch hats.

Mr. SCOTT-MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): I wish to give my experience of the heat wave on the field day at Aldershot, and some ideas of mine as to how unfortunate occurrences of this kind may be avoided in future. It is quite true that an excessive heat wave came on in the middle of the day, which no amount of prevision could have anticipated except a previous communication with the clerk of the weather. I attribute the cases of sunstroke on that day to the fact that neither a helmet nor a suitable head-dress for a hot day was provided. I am certain that if any soldier in the Army or Reserve force were asked, he would say that the helmet, as at present designed, is not a suitable head-dress. It is almost impossible to shoot with precision in it. If I had to choose between helmet and forage cap, I would prefer the forage cap, which is much more comfortable. On that particular day it was necessary that the Aldershot force should march a longer distance than the eastern force, but even in the latter a large number suffered from the heat, although they wore helmets. The best solution of the problem would be the provision of a head-dress similar to that given to the various irregular corps we lately sent out to South Africa. It is a great mistake to say that the sun in England is less powerful than in South Africa. I have felt the sun on Salisbury Plain far harder and more trying than I ever did in South Africa. Therefore, when my hon. friend is designing the cap of the future, he should design something soft, and which will not necessarily obscure the vision, as the helmet does.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Under the adroit management of the

Under Secretary for War we have drifted into a discussion of the best military head-dress of the future. While I admire this adroitness, I think we should have some sort of explanation as to who is responsible for what took place at Aldershot. As a matter of fact some soldiers died, and a great many suffered from sunstroke. How did that occur? A large number of men were taken out to manœuvre, when the thermometer was above 90 degrees and a hot sun was shining, without practically any covering to their heads, and made to march great distances. Someone must have been responsible. The hon. Gentleman says that there was no culpable negligence. I do not know what he means by culpable negligence. I do not suppose that any officer went out with the intention to destroy life; but there was negligence, and that negligence was palpably culpable. This is not the first time it has occurred. We have had like stories before, and each time we have been told that something is to be done in the future. I want to know who is responsible. The hon. Gentleman says the War Office sent an enormous quantity of helmets abroad, and consequently there were none at Aldershot.

MR. WYNDHAM: There were none in reserve.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Yes; but if that be the case some general or commander is responsible for what has occurred. After all, we credit a general with some modicum of common-sense which we civilians have; and we know that if we send men out to walk a long distance when the sun is shining, without any head-covering, there will be some accident. I should like to know whether some officer at Aldershot should not have the right to say: "The day is unsuited to take these men out for a very long march, and therefore they should stay at home, or the effect will be the sickness of a great many men." I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman that we ought not to ask who is responsible, but ought only to discuss what is to be a fitting head-dress for our soldiers in the future. I daresay there may be some soldiers who take a great pleasure in having a very bad and uncomfortable hat because the like was worn at the battle of Minden. But the world has progressed since that battle, and probably the latest hat is the best under all the circumstances. But that is not the question of the moment. I want to know what are the powers of the Commanding Officer at Aldershot, and how it was that that commanding officer, knowing what the heat of the day was, did not prevent that march.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member for Lichfield has brought forward a question that has been urged in the House before by himself, and also by the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire—namely, the great desire on the part of the officers of Militia that their men should have new clothing.

MR. WARNER: I said they should have at least one suit of new clothes.

MR. WYNDHAM: I will not argue the question again, but I may say that the Militiamen gets two suits which, theoretically, have to last in wear seven months in ordinary times; whereas the regular soldier gets two suits and a tunic which have to last two years.

MR. WARNER: They are made of different cloth.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am sure that the hon. Gentleman will agree with me that the clothes ought to last at least more than one or two trainings. It is clear that to give a brand-new outfit in each case would entail a great cost compared with that of the Regular Army. In my own mind, and that of Lord Lansdowne, the plan of issuing old clothes to the Militia has been pushed much too far, and a remedy for that grievance has been considered. But hon. Members will remember that at the beginning of the session I had to withdraw any permanent proposals with regard to the Militia. I trust, however, that Lord Lansdowne may be in a position, after the experience of this summer, to arrive at a conclusion in regard to the matter before the end of the session. The other speeches have turned on the casualties at Aldershot. I have really nothing to add to what I have already said. The hon. Member was not in the House when I gave a narration of the facts. Directly the heat came on the "cease fire" was sounded, and the men were ordered home. But it was then too late. When I put forward all the facts I am sometimes accused of representing that such a catastrophe was inevitable.

I did not say that at all. I say that such an occurrence can be avoided, but only by experience and practice. With the Royal Reservists and many new Militia battalions and new officers, it is impossible to expect that everything will go as well as when some one General has commanded a division for three or four years in succession. It is not fair, in such circumstances, to pick out for blame one officer who has done his best, and say "You, and you alone are responsible." The War Office is responsible certainly for having followed the policy of many years in not having a large supply of 150,000 helmets in store. We did not adopt that policy, nor did our predecessors; and I do not believe that anyone without the experience of South Africa would have questioned the policy we did adopt.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I would like to ask just one question as to the sanitary arrangements of the Royal Clothing Factory. For some time past the workpeople have made complaints of the shocking state of these arrangements.

MR. WYNDHAM: On a point of order. Might not this matter come better under the Barracks Vote?

Vote agreed to.

4. £8,000,000, Warlike and other Stores: Supply and Repair.

MR. WARNER: I wish to ask a question on the state of the rifles throughout the country. I know the difficulty at the present time of supplying rifles and replacing those that are worn out. But many of the rifles given to troops that may be sent abroad any day are quite worn out, and some of them are obsolete.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD: I wish to call attention to the grievance felt very strongly by soldiers who have deductions made from their pay in connection with what is called barrack damages. I have a note from an officer in command of a battalion 900 strong in South Africa, who had served upon him a demand for one penny! That demand was sent 6,500 miles, all the way to Bloemfontein, and sent back the other 6,500 miles, and the sum of one penny has to be divided between 900 men! I have seen another demand for a halfpenny, which has also travelled the 13,000 miles involved in the journey to and from South Africa, and yet another for 2s. 6d., which has to be divided amongst five regiments! It is comforting to know that while we are spending so many millions on the war the War Office authorities are economising in regard to pence. This is, though small, a serious grievance.

MR. BROWN (Shropshire, Wellington) said he had heard that the ambulance wagons were not at all what they might be expected to be, and he suggested that experiments should be made with the object of securing a more convenient wagon, and one which could be more easily drawn.

MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid) said it would greatly assist the formation of rifle clubs if rifles and a certain number of rounds of ammunition were granted to members on more favourable terms than at present.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked the Under Secretary for War whether he had considered the possibility of utilising the large number of Mauser rifles which were coming into our hands in South Africa, and also some part of the ammunition which had not been destroyed, for the benefit of rifle clubs. Even if it were not considered advisable to give the rifles for nothing, the members of rifle clubs might be allowed to purchase them at a small cost.

MR. ALLAN (Gateshead) asked the Under Secretary where the War Office was purchasing its field guns. Twelve months ago the Financial Secretary to the War Office, in reply to a question put by him, said that the authorities were converting some of their present field pieces into so-called quick-firing guns, and also that they had under consideration a quick-firing field piece, which, no doubt, would be the best—as usual. But from that day to this we knew nothing as to who was making these guns. He asked, therefore, who was making these guns, and where they were being made, and why this great increase was necessary; also, whether the guns were made in this country or abroad; whether they were our own design; whether they were converted guns, converted from the old slow-firing field pieces, or whose design they were. He respectfully put these questions to the hon. Gentleman, and would like to have an answer thereto.

MR. WYNDHAM: Not only the guns, but in the stores we shall receive at the termination of the war, there will be many articles in a much worn condition, and that undoubtedly will necessitate their replacement by others which we hope will be an improvement. We hope to profit by our new experience. A great part of our ambulance stores went to South Africa, and it has been found desirable for the future to build lighter ambulance wagons for use on rough ground. With regard to the small claims, as soon as the War Office discovered the system they stopped it as far as possible; but you must have a method in these matters, but in every system there should be a certain amount of elasticity. Rifles and ammunition are supplied to rifle clubs at the cost of production, and cannot be supplied cheaper. The gun licence has also been withdrawn upon all rifles belonging to rifle clubs, and beyond that we are not prepared to go. It is not the intention of the Government to supply those clubs with rifles free when the wants of the Army and the Volunteers have to be attended to. With regard to field guns, as to which the hon. Member for Gateshead asked a series of categorical questions, I do not think I ought to say where they are being purchased, but as to the type of gun, I think I can show him in a few words the type of gun we shall get. The new guns which have been ordered embody all the latest improvements, some of which come from the type of one manufacturer, say Vickers, and others were evolved at Woolwich. This gun would fire eight rounds per minute instead of five, and we only ordered a sufficient number for six or seven batteries of horse artillery and thirty-six batteries of field artillery. This will afford an experiment on a large scale, and if the gun turns out to be the best that money can buy, the artillery will be armed with it.

MR. ALLAN again asked whether the guns were being made in this country or purchased from abroad. Was the War Office still in the arena of experiment with field guns for the Army, and would the right hon. Gentleman say upon what ground he based the expenditure of £802,000 of public money in this way?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already answered these questions. I am not prepared to go into details on the subject; but the majority of the guns have been ordered from manufacturers in this country, and some from the arsenal at Woolwich. When the hon. Member asks if the War Office is still in the arena of experiment, my answer is that they always are and always will be.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Will the rifle clubs be allowed to purchase the Mauser rifles, thousands of which are now coming into our hands in South Africa, at a reasonable price?

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said he would like to ask two questions. The Vote before the Committee was to provide for current wants, and he wished to know whether the War Office fixed a standard of reserve with regard to the various armaments and equipment which should always be maintained. He presumed a reserve was kept, but he wished to know whether these items under discussion meant that when an extra strain was put upon the country our reserve of armaments and equipment entirely disappeared. He asked the question in order to afford the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of an explanation. The reserve cavalry regiments had been lamentably deficient in saddlery if he could trust the information which he had received, and which had come from well-informed sources. The second point he wished to refer to was the growing expenditure by the War Office for boats and vessels. That appeared to him to be more a matter for the Admiralty, but he noticed under Sub-head E an item of £45,000 for boats and vessels. He objected to the item because soldiers were not the proper persons to take charge of boats and vessels. Under Sub-head I. there was an item of £80,000 for a similar matter, "including vessels and for repairs." He desired some explanation of these items, as it appeared to him that inside the War Office a miniature Admiralty was growing up, and he objected to the principles.

CAPTAIN NORTON pressed for an answer as to what was being done with the thousands of Mauser rifles coming into the possession of our troops in South Africa, whether they were to be sold in South Africa, or whether they would be sold in this country for the benefit of rifle clubs.

MR. HARDY (Kent, Ashford) pointed out that although the Yeomanry were taken to different places in order to be trained, and to acquire greater skill in shooting, it was rather late in the day to allow them to shoot with obsolete weapons. He drew attention to the carbines now being issued, and asked whether the old form of carbine was being manufactured and issued, or whether it was intended to arm the Yeomanry with an improved and more modern weapon.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Baronet the Member for Great Yarmouth has really raised a very large question. As to reserves of armaments and equipment, of course there are reserves in this country, but they are not, in the opinion of the Director General of Ordnance, at all adequate to meet our needs, nor do I think that a fixed standard of reserve has been arrived at or maintained in respect of many articles. It is a very important question, and one upon which the Director General was at work long before the war broke out, and a Committee has been engaged in collecting a great deal of evidence on which the Government will act. As, however, I shall have to explain the programme adopted to the House, I would ask the hon. Member not to anticipate the explanation now. But the principle of a fixed reserve has been accepted. The War Office is not going to enter into competition with the Admiralty in the matter of vessels and boats, but there are cases in which money is saved by the Army having its own boats, as, for example, to tow targets, to carry coals and stores from one shore to another. We recognise the necessity of arming all the troops with the most recent weapon, and as soon as a better carbine is obtained it will be supplied to the Yeomanry.

*SIR J. COLOMB asked whether, when the hon. Gentleman came to the House with his proposals, he would be in a position to say who was responsible for the present condition of things.

MR. WYNDHAM: No one is responsible. The Government is responsible.

CAPTAIN NORTON: And what about the Mauser rifles?

MR. WYNDHAM: I will consider that suggestion, but the time is not ripe.

Vote agreed to.

5. £2,670,700, Works, Buildings, and Repairs. Cost, including Staff for Engineer Services.

DR. FARQUHARSON desired to know what was being done as to the erection of the new barracks in Millbank. The right hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the Treasury no doubt knew this subject by heart, as he had been bombarded by questions upon it. He (Dr. Farquharson) was very anxious upon the question, having regard to the fact that the St. George's Barracks abut on the National Gallery. He wished to know when the War Office was going to do its share towards the preservation of the very valuable pictures of the nation from the risk of being destroyed; and when people might lie down at night without the reflection that a fire might dissipate the whole of these valuable pictures acquired at great expense. The strong argument against removing the barracks appeared to be that this was a great recruiting ground; but if the right hon. Gentleman had been down to the barracks and seen the way in which the recruiting was done he would admit that nothing was so likely to chill the early military ardour of the recruit as taking him to this barracks, which was a deadly, dreary, depressing, dirty hole. The first thing to be done was to clear the barracks away, and put them where they ought to be, at Millbank. There was only eighteen inches of brickwork between the Turner Room in the National Gallery and the canteen room of the barracks, which might be filled with inflammable materials, and what possible precaution could be taken to protect the National Gallery from fire or smoke, volumes of which would be projected in at the windows if the wind was blowing in a favourable direction? The hon. Member also asked what was being done to make the Piershill barracks more sanitary. It was unfair that young people should be compelled to live in such a very insanitary place. He also pressed for information as to the working of the sewage farm at Aldershot.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that perhaps the Financial Secretary would be able to say what steps, if any, had been taken with regard to the improvement of sanitary arrangements at the factory at Pimlico. Very grave complaints, he was informed, had been made with regard to the sanitary arrangements there.

MR. WARNER noticed that in the Vote there was no sum put down for huts or anything of that description. A very large number had been ordered, and he thought their cost ought to appear in this Vote. Wooden huts were essentially temporary matters, and that item should appear.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.) asked what progress had been made in the provision of cubicles in barracks. He drew attention to the fact that considerable interest was displayed in this subject in the previous year, and it would be interesting to know what steps had been taken. Another subject to which he drew attention was the lighting of the barrack rooms, which in a great many cases, especially in the sleeping rooms, were lighted with only one gas burner, and that very often a very bad one. Anything more depressing could not be conceived. He wished to know whether there was any intention to instal the electric light in barracks.

*SIR J. COLOMB asked why no provision was made in this Estimate for the accommodation of the garrison at Wei-hai-wei. He also called attention to the fact that for the first time a sum of £25,400 appeared in these Estimates in respect of the garrison at Esquimalt. Under the old system the cost of the garrison at Esquimalt was defrayed by the Government of Canada.

MR. ALLAN asked why in this Vote there was nothing allowed for the defence of the river Tyne. There were no fortifications there for the defence of the river, which was second in importance to none in the Empire. It had on its banks what was practically the principal arsenal in the Empire, even excelling that of Woolwich. He should be glad to know why there was nothing on the Estimates for the defence of the river.

MR. WYNDHAM: The defence of the Tyne and the accommodation of the garrison at Wei-hai-wei were provided for in the loan of last year. The Government are taking £500,000 for huts in South Africa, and £500,000 for huts at home. It is quite certain that a certain number of troops will remain in South Africa, and very probably a certain number will come back before there is barrack accommodation for them in this country. Therefore, we are making provision for the supply of huts. There is also a sum of about £47,000 for putting up storehouses in which the reserve stores will be placed. With that exception there is nothing in this Vote which raises any new question of policy. With regard to the Esquimalt garrison, an arrangement has been come to between the Colonial Office and the Government of Canada in accordance with which Canada will eventually contribute £12,500 of this money. If the hon. Member for West Newington can point out any grave defect in the sanitary arrangements at the Pimlico depôt the matter will be attended to. As to the question of cubicles, it will be recollected that the Government undertook to build barracks so that the cubicle system could be introduced. That has been done, and experiments have been made, but the last six months has not been suitable for these experiments.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked where the enormous number of huts to be provided in this country were to be put up.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.): The exact localities have not been definitely settled. The question as to the National Gallery should have been addressed to my right hon. friend at the head of the Office of Works. There is no actual contact between the National Gallery and the St. George's Barracks. But as soon as the barracks at Millbank are completed there will be a removal from Trafalgar Square to them. The work at Millbank is being pushed forward as rapidly as possible, but I cannot say when it will be finished. As regards the barracks at Piershill the hon. Gentleman is under a misapprehension. The barracks at Piershill may not be the most comfortable, but they certainly are not such as to be wholly condemned. The sanitary condition of the sewage farm at Aldershot is first rate, and it is undoubtedly an advantage to the camp to receive supplies from it.

MR. ALLAN: May I call the hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that it is well known that Piershill barracks are insanitary, notwithstanding what he may say to the contrary. I dare say it is simply because they happen to be Scotch barracks that you are not interested in them. It is well known that they are the most insanitary barracks in the whole of Scotland.

DR. FARQUHARSON stated that residence in Piershill barracks was harmful to the health of the men. He also remarked that there was no use trying to get away from the fact that the canteen room of St. George's Barracks was separated by only eighteen inches from the National Gallery. He could state on the authority of the President of the Royal Academy that the National Gallery was subjected to great danger in that way.

COLONEL WELBY stated that on account of the insanitary condition of Piershill Barracks it would be far better instead of spending money on them to remove them right away to another place.

MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS promised to take the opinion of the Director-General of the Army Medical Department as to the actual sanitary condition of the buildings and site of Piershill barracks.

Vote agreed to.

6. £113,800, Establishments for Military Education.

7. £66,900, Miscellaneous Effective Services.

8. £1,611,000, Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers, &c.

MR. BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) drew the attention of the Committee to the manner in which Line officers serving in the Militia had been treated with reference to retired pay. It had been the custom of the War Office to try and attract Line officers into the Militia by giving them extra pensions or additional retired pay if they served a certain number of years in the Militia. On embodiment, however, the retired pay was taken away altogether, so that during the whole of the embodiment the officers merely received the ordinary pay of a Line captain. There were other instances in which the treatment of the officers was absurd. It would be said that the officers knew perfectly well that they would not receive retired pay if the Militia was embodied, but from the point of view of broad policy he denied that it was wise to deprive the officers at a time of national emergency of money which really represented pension for past services. He hoped that this matter would be very fully considered, and that the War Office would treat these officers not merely with bare justice but with liberality.

MR. ALLAN: This Vote is entitled "For half-pay and other charges for officers," and the total of this Vote represents £1,611,000. If I am not at all diverging from the point, I should like to ask the reason why that sum of money is voted for officers, while there is a less sum of money voted for the non-commissioned officers and men.

*MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: With regard to the question just raised, the answer is a very simple one. The conditions of service which the officers accept, and which the men accept are provided for in this Vote. The officer accepts a commission on the condition that he is entitled to a certain pension. The soldier, on the other hand, accepts service in the Army on a different condition. The one condition results in the charge provided for in this Vote, and the other in the charge to which the hon. Member has also referred, and which is on another Vote. Turning to the question raised by my hon. friend the Member for Tonbridge, I think he has put his finger upon an anomaly. He points out that the officer who has retired with a pension has the whole of his pension stopped whilst the Militia with which he is serving is embodied; while on the other hand, another officer who has retired on a gratuity has the advantage of the interest on that gratuity without any stoppage as was formerly the case. I think that is an anomaly, and I will call the attention of my noble friend the Secretary of State to the matter with a view to taking his opinion as to whether something cannot be done in regard to it. With regard to the general question, however, I do not think my hon. friend has made out a grievance. A retired officer joins the Militia on the condition that he should receive a certain pension; embodiment takes place, and during the period of embodiment that officer is certainly pecuniarily better off than he would be if he were receiving only his pension. The difficulty in the way of his receiving his pension at the same time that he receives full pay is that he may be serving alongside a brother officer who would not be receiving anything like as much for his services as the retired officer serving with the Militia would get, if he got not only his full pay but his pension also. I think that is the answer to my hon. friend, and he can hardly expect under such circumstances that any change will be made.

Mr. BOSCAWEN: May I point out that the man who takes a gratuity receives the interest on that gratuity in addition to his pay. The other man asks simply that he should get the equivalent to that interest, otherwise he is not really getting full pay, as a part of the pay comes from the Government and the other part really out of his own pocket, because during embodiment he is losing the whole of his pension.

Vote, agreed to.

9. £1,379,000, Pensions and other Non-Effective Charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others.

10. £186,000, Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £63,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Ordnance Factories (the cost of the Productions of which will be charged to the Army, Navy, and Indian and Colonial Governments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): This Vote is not down for to-day——

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): The hon. Gentleman, I think, was about to rise to a point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am given to understand—though it is not for me to say—that the Ordnance Factory Vote is included in the Army Estimates. I suppose, therefore, in the strictly technical sense it is down for to-day. But I believe in ordinary practice it is taken separately, and if objection is seriously taken to it the Government will not press it. At the same time, it would be a convenience if we could get it to-night.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is one of those Votes upon which there is always a considerable amount of discussion, and it is always put down separately. That is the reason I objected; not that I wished to hinder progress at all.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Civil Service and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1900-1901.

Class VI.

11. £284,058, to complete the sum for Superannuations and Retired Allowances.

12. £1,800, to complete the sum for Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions.

13. £725, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances.

Class VII.

14. £9,452, to complete the sum for Temporary Commissions.

15. £1,370, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Expenses.

16. £1,000, to complete the sum for Paris Exhibition, 1900.

Resolutions to be reported upon Thursday; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid): Might I ask the hon. Gentleman whether he can give us any idea as to when the Housing of the Working Classes Bill will come on?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: On Monday, I think.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Balfour*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty minutes before Nine o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 20th June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

CHRISTCHURCH AND BOURNEMOUTH TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP D).

Mr. ALEXANDER HARGREAVES BROWN reported from the Committee on Group D of Private Bills, That, for the better securing of a uniform decision with that of the Select Committee on Electric Power Bills, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, the 28th instant, at Twelve of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

ROCHDALE CORPORATION BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section A), with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Maxwelltown; Greenock; Dunoon; Lanark; and Motherwell; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Petition from Argyll, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSED PREMISES (HOURS OF SALE) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Chorley; and Ticehurst; to lie upon the Table.

PETTY CUSTOMS ABOLITION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Cupar, against; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petition from Peebles, against establishment; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Worthing; Maidstone; Farnworth; Alnwick (six); Newbury; Belford; Berwick-on-Tweed; Cullercoats; Berkhampstead; Summit; Gateshead-on-Tyne (two); Morpeth; Cromer; Bilston; Whitley Bay (four); Shankhouse; Upholland; Aylsham; Peckham; Cramlington; Eastleigh; Wilby; Whaplode; Glascote; Greenhithe; Tamworth; Fazeley; Stretford; Norwich; Witney; Worthing; Maidenhead; Downham Market; Lancaster; and Helson; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against, from York; Portsmouth; South Somerset; Rhondda Valley; Eccles; North Berkshire; Coventry; Walsall; Northampton (two); Tunbridge Wells; Redditch; Reading (three); and Norwich; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Sheffield (sixty-three); Southampton (twenty-nine); Birmingham (thirty-three); Grimsby (seven); Hirwain; Cleethorpes (two); Penydarren; Clydey; Barnsley (twenty); Wood Green (two); Latchford; Merthyr Tydfil; Lovington; Castle Cary; South Barrow; South Cheriton; Long Sutton; Bristol (ten); Shepton Mallet; Evercreech; Montgomery; Wincanton; Yenston; Govan; Milborne Port; Pilton; Liscard (two); Irthlingboro'; Kettering; Warblington; Long Sutton; Mansfield; Petersfield; Barrow-on-Soar; Letheringsett; Shoreham; Tulse Hill; Herne Hill (four); Mansfield Woodhouse; Wadebridge; Eastwood; Warsop; Sleasley Vale; Irchester; Coseley; Seghill; Whitley Bay (seven); Monk Bretton (four); Low Swithen; Darton; Great Houghton; Gawber; Newcastle-on-Tyne (six); Chadderton (two); North Moor; Heyside; Jarrow-on-Tyne; Hebburn; Spennymoor (two); Hett; East Howle; Stockton-on-Tees; Coxhoe (two); Dartmouth Park; West Bowling; Bradford; Sedgley (two); Bilston (two); Old Buckenham; Littleshall; Wadebridge; Margate (two); St Peters; Ramsgate (four); Wendling; Holt; Cromer; Reading (ten); Grey friars; Riston; Weybourne; Sunderland (four); Notting Hill; Mansfield; Mareham-le-Fen; Horncastle; Lowestoft; Coningsby; Canterbury; Shaldon; Dawlish; Clay Cross (three); Stepney; Blakeney; George Hughes; Sheringham; Bargoed; North Brixton; Clay-next-Sea; Brixton (three); Lewisham (two); Bolton; Whitwick; Pontypridd; Brockley Road; Deptford; Teignmouth; Newton Abbot (two); Newent; Chelmsford; Gellygaer (three); Llanbedr (two); Penebo; Barmouth; Harlech; Arthog; Dolgelly; Merrington Lane; Bewholme; Hornsea; Derby; Brimington; Woolley; Hetton Downs; Tower Hamlets; Calow; Grassmoor (two); Chesterfield; South Wales; Trefriw; Standish (three); Blyth (two); Winster; West Sleekburn; Newton Hyde; Mount Sorrell; Netherfield; Bedlington Colliery; Marlborough (two); Coniston; Wawne: Newport (Isle of Wight); Sutton; Carlisle; Aldershot; Netherton; Platt Bridge; Yeovil; Devizes; Orrell; Chertsey (two); Widnes; Brisley; Wellington; Timsbury; Thorpe St. Matthew; New Catton; Southgate; Eaton St. Andrew; Taunton; Wigan; Shore Edge; Oldham; Manchester; Royton; Withington; Workington; Little Hulton (two); Cockermouth (two); Eighton Banks; Windy Nook; Little Broughton; Wyndham Road; Chorley (five); Withnell Mill; Wheelton; Coppull; Brinscall; Adlington; Mountsorrell; Whittle-le-Woods; Euxton; Kelvedon (two); Halstead; Mossley; Maldon; Bocking; Whitwick; Kilmarnock; Stisted; Heyside; Southend-on-Sea; Althorne; Blindcrakes; Aspatria; Thirsk; Bury (three); Alverstoke; Liverpool (three); Basingstoke; Devizes; Coundon Gate; Wellington; St. George's-in-the-East; Battersea (three); Farnworth (three); Lopen; Middleton; Ventnor; Ratcliff; Kearsley; South Hayling; Shankhouse; Woodford; Leyton; Walthamstow; Southsea; Walton-on-Thames; Cromer; Leytonstone (five); Elkington Street; Earsdon; Emsworth; Haslingden; Leicester; Oswaldtwistle; Heywood; Newton Row; Smithy Bridge; Hay Mills; Yardley; Cranleigh; Crabbery Hall; Mapplewell; Shafton; Eastleigh; Halifax; Hoyle Mill; Boldron; Ardsley; Hebburn; Bishop Auckland; Tottington; Rochdale; Epsom; —Middleton; Northampton (two); Shepley; Little Leigh; Wincham; Whitegate; Gateshead (five); Darlington; Baildon; South Monmouth; Morton; Ilkley; New Miller Dam; Barugh (two); Higham; Smithies; Lanner; Middlesbrough (six); Hartlepool; Wolsingham; Pool; Four Lanes; Redruth (four); Portreath; Tolskithy; Camborne (two); Broad Lane; Worsley; Tow Law (two); Egglesburn; Northallerton; Billy Row; West Hartlepool; Stockton-on-Tees; Auckland Park; Saltburn-by-the-Sea; Staindrop; Darlington (six); Stockton-on-Tees (four); Bishop Auckland (two); Guisborough; Carlin How; Beeth; West Hartlepool (two); Whitby; Binchester; Northallerton; Skelton; Margrove Park; Frosterley; Coundon Gate; Evenwood; Middleton-in-Teesdale; Brougham Street; Close House; Shildon; North Ormesby; Toronto; Deri; Whitby; Old Shildon; New Shildon; Howden-le-Wear; Eston; Thirsk; Stockton; Rawmarsh; Rotherham (four); Topsham; Fivehead; North Petherton; Bridgwater (two); Ilminster; North Curry; Midgley; Stafford; Warminster; Great Somerford (two); Sherston Magna; Seagry; Cleverton; Malmesbury; Hullavington; Garsdon; Hetton Downs; Newcastle; Rochester; Oakley; Broadwell; Bourton-on-the-Water; Attercliffe; Tetbury; Cirencester (two); Bledington; Newport (Mon.); Skewton Magna; Brighton; Carlton; Bolton; Leeds (thirty-two); Exeter (two); Burnt Hill; Quick's Green; Glasgow; Andover; Easton; Workington; Hunslet; Roundhay; Brighton; Lancaster; Clapton; Stratford; Brixham (two); Alnwick (four); Belle Vale; Nelson; Blaenavon; Garndiffaith; Abersychan; Bilton; Cwmbach; Coventry; Windsor; Llanfihangel Gobion; Lower Clapton; Shotley Bridge; Westwood; Blackhill; Annfield Plain; Soham (four); Milkwell Burn; Newbury; Pontypridd (two); Liverpool; Hougham; Ashton-in-Makerfield; Bradwell; Buxton; Wokingham; South Croydon; Plymouth; Great Berkhampsted (two); Hallow; Worcester; Croydon (sixteen); Thornton; Berkhampsted; Heath; Compstall; Torquay; Plymouth; Ulverston; Yeadon (two); Stockcross; Abercarn (two); Buchan; Cartmel; Paisley; Mynyddislwyn; Alnwick; Norton; Aldershot; Stockport, Burley; High Wycombe; Portsmouth; Wellingborough; Clerkenwell; Yorkston; Great Yarmouth (five); Ireby; Carnforth; Beal; Morecambe; Lancaster; Waterloo (two); Askam-in-Furness; Clitheroe (three); Slaidburn;

Downham (two); Colne (three); Keswick; Percy Main; Sawley; Chatburn (two); Harrop; Swarth Moor; Slaidburn; Darnall (four); Endcliffe Park (two); Dalton-in-Furness; Attercliffe; Helson; Briercliffe (two); New Cullercoats; Wortley (three); Wednesbury (three); Barrowford (two); Micheldever; Barley; Darlaston; Lea Brook; Tipton; Ecclesfield; Oxford; Cheltenham; Horsforth; Wortley (two); Holbeck; Chesham; Bladon; Armley (two); Bramley; Peasedown; Bolton (two); Bletchington; Murcott; Heath Town; Wolverhampton; Rhymney; Long Handborough; Berwick on Tweed (two); Hammersmith; Witney; Oswestry; Bradley; Whitehaven; St. Mawes; Wanstead; Barking; Helston; Manfield; Griffithstown; Manor Park (two); Heckmondwike; Oswaldtwistle; Westbourne; Chatham (eight); Lambeth; Grove; Accrington; Boxmoor; Clayton-le-Moors; Carneddan; Standford Hill; Egremont; Petersfield; Lindford; Liphook; Holybourne; Alresford (two); Baybridge; Swaffham; Bolton-le-Moors; Bracknell; Neckalls (two); Wimbledon; Causeway Green; Wishaw; Toxteth Park; Powerby; Walsham-le-Willows; Stratford New Town (two); Little Lever; Hampstead; Maidenhead; Enfield (four); Faversham (three); Heckmondwike; Lynton; Lambeth; Silloth; Longtown (two); Carlisle; Dalston; Cumwhinton; Carlton; Norwood (four); Brampton; Street; Glastonbury; Onslow Square; Thornton Heath (two); Snodland; Heywood; Bispham; Hopwood; Pendleton; Billinge; Barnstaple (four); Bodmin; Bideford; Penoletory; Callington; Worcester; St. Cleer; Common Moor; Somerton; Mytholmroyd; Welford; Wilbarston; Great Harwood (three); Stowmarket; St. Pancras; Haydock; Addiscombe; Blackburn; Earlestown; Seppard; Wattisfield; West Felton; Weirbrook; Perkins Beach; Shrewsbury; Dorrington; Clapham Road; Heeley; Liverpool (four); Edmonton; Stratford-on-Avon; Cotham Grove; Redland; London; Lordship Lane; Hull (six); Stoneferry; Cannock; Ashbrittle; Milverton; Brighouse (four); Bishopston; Kimbolton; Tamworth (three); Brislington; Crawshawbooth (three); Furness Vale; Compstall; Chelmorton; Flagg; Whitewynch; Holbeach (two); Spalding; Little London; Weston Hills; Lutton; Moulton Leas End; Holbeach Bank; Whaplode; Gedney Drove; Kettlebrook; Lewes; Rastrick (two); Clifton; Worcester; Quarry Bank (two); Dudley (three); Red Hill; Roadwater; Birch's Coppice; Chaceterrace : Norton Canes; Brownhills; Norton East; Cradley Heath (two); Brierley Hill; St. Luke's; Wakefield; Lichfield; Kingsbrompton; Horley; Lumb; Airdrie; Pontyberem; Queenborough; Acocks Green; Springside; Cloughfold; Whitwell Bottom; Newchurch; Walsall; Foleshill; Reigate; Griffith C. Owen; Fishponds; Maidstone (two); Downfield; Porlock; Barrow-in-Furness; Gosford; Belford; Rushcliffe; Faringdon; East Hagbourne; Park Corner; Wallingford; Bressingham; Meadow Hall; West Ham (three); Pontgwyn; Bardwell; Ramsbottom; Coventry (two); Fareham (two); Falmouth; Hackney (two); Canning Town (three); Plaistow (two); Stratford; Brixham (three); South Hackney; Hinderclay; Harwood; Beenham; Yallendon; Whitehaven; Thetford; Blackburn; Chesham; Hampstead; Downham Market; Hoxton (three); Windsor; Bayswater; Bardon Park; Ashby-de-la-Zouch (two); Coate; Paddington; Old Street; Kidlington; Tranmere; Summertown; Griffithstown; Stoke Ferry; Aylesbury; Brookfield; Nottingham (three); Topsham; Brighton; Golborne; Earlestown (two); Newton-le-Willows; Brynn; Ashton-in-Makerfield (two); Saltley; Middleton-by-Wirksworth; Heckmondwike; Stafford; Great Wakering; Oatlands; Littletown (two); Hightown; Clown; Widnes; Poolsbrook; Marsden Moor; Staveley; Dronfield; Cradley; Hayes Lane; Hindley; Bradford; Pontypridd; Nuneaton (four); Ashton-under-Lyne; Fulham (two); Pemberton; Lendall; Broughton; Llandilo; Darlington; Walthamstow (eight); South Woodford (three); Woodford Green (two); Chingford; Bridlington (three); Biggin; Diss (three); Minchinhampton; Woodton; Burston; Stroud; Burnham; Weston-super-Mare (two); Reading (three); Peckham (two); Nunhead; Cramlington; Seaton Delaval; Laisterdyke; Wisbech; Foxhole; Combe (two); St. Austell (three); Mount Charles; Glensplat; Amersham; Colnbrook; Ferryhill; Tudhoe; Barkby; Syston; Belgrave; Leicester; Thurmaston; Melton Mowbray; Havant; Greenock; Helmshore; Woodford; Ystrad; Treorchy; Ystradyfodwg (five); Leyton; Croxdale; Merthyr

Tydfil; Norwood; Trimwood Colliery; Haswell; Plymouth (two); York; Three Towns; North Walsham; Hickling; Potter; Heigham; Weston; Dilham; Neath; Swansea; Shipley; Queensbury; Bakewell; Ashbourne; Brook and Wye; Hathersage; Winchester (two); New Brighton; Brixham; South Norwood; Milton; Ecclesfield (two); Selhurst; Newcastle-under-Lyme; Great Harwood; Greenborough; Barrow-in-Furness; Old Radford; Old Lenton; Sheerness (eleven); Great Totham; and Norwich (fifty-nine); to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Keith; Brechin; Paisley; Arbroath; Edinburgh; Partick; Pollockshaws; Airdrie; Montrose: Dunfermline; Stirling; and Falkirk; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Edinburgh; Dundee (five); Glasgow; Dumfries; Jedburgh; Kilarron; Kilchoman; Falkirk; Stornoway; and Logiewester; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition of the Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Coundon Gate; Northampton; Shepley; Boldron; Farnworth (four); Bishop Auckland; Leicester; Todmorden (two); Tottington (two); Heywood (three); Smithy Bridge; London (four); Birmingham (thirteen); Walthamstow; Leyton; Woodford; Earsdon; Shankhouse; Heyside (two); Shore Edge; Little Hulton; Kearsley; Radcliffe; Wellington; Althorne; Gateshead (six); Blindcrake; Maldon; Whitwick (two); Adlington; Euxton; Chorley (four); Wheelton; Coppull; Brinscall; Withnell Mill; Manchester; Eighton Banks; Wyndham Row; Cockermouth (two); Workington; Royton; Little Broughton; Thirsk; Liverpool; Wigan; Wellington; Brisley; East Cowes; Winster; Hyde; Blyth; Morpeth; Standish; Sutton; Coniston; Wawne; Bewholme; Hornsea; Mount Sorrell; Merrington Lane; Spennymoor; Sheringham; Stepney; Wangford; Lowestoft; Govan; Sheffield (twenty-eight); Notting Hill; Riston; Weybourne; Cley-next-Sea; Margate (two); Old Buckenham; Oswaldtwistle (two); East Howle; Jarrow-on-Tyne; Hebburn Colliery; Coxhoe; Hett; Hebburn; Newtown-on-Tyne; Chadderton (two); Spennymoor; Glodwick; Oldham; North Moor; Trefriw; Ashington and Hirst; Bilston (two); Stockton-on-Tees; Sedgley; Barrow-on-Soar; Grimsby (four); Aberdare; Montgomery; Latchford; Barnsley; Clydey; Horncastle; Wincanton; Mareham-le-Fen; Coningsby; South Barrow; Long Sutton; Horsington; Shepton Mallet; Evercreech; Pilton; Lavington; Seaforth; Macclesfield; Tetbury: Tisbury; Chedworth; Calne; Cirencester (two); Cwm-y-gaist; Oakham; Stockport (two); Deal; Ely; Stretton Westwood; Chippenham; Knaresborough; Hibaldstow; Whiteparish; Westhoughton; Dundee (two); Sunderland; Warsop; Pleasley Vale; Mansfield; Nuncargate; East Kirkby; Truro; North Brixton; Cradley Heath (two); Brockley Road; Newton Abbot; Berwick-upon-Tweed (two); Bradley; Whitehaven; St. Mawes; Helston; Griffithstown; Clayton-le-Moors; Watford; Heckmondwike; Rishton (two); Accrington; Long Eaton; Percy Main; Letheringsett; Ilfracombe; Bodmin; Callington; Saltash; Welford; Haydock; Paisley; Great Harwood (two); Stowmarket; Earlestown; Wilbarston; Wattisfield; West Felton (two); Lyth Hill; Dorrington; Carneddan; Wanstead; Barking; Manor Park; Chatham; Bardwell; Upton Park; Holybourne; Peppard; Moseley Road (two); Selhurst; Millom; Oxford; Meadow Hall; Stanton St. John; Cassington; Aberguile; West Ham Park; Canning Town (two); Plaistow; Yattendon; Thetford; Chesham; Goole; Maidstone (five); Farringdon; Walsall; Hinderclay; Abingdon; Wakefield; Redhill; Ashton-under-Lyne; Minehead; Ramsbottom; Queenborough; Llandarrog; Reigate (two); Springside; Cloughfold; Newchurch; Whitewell Bottom; Crawshawbooth (two); Sittingbourne; Rawtenstall (four); Bressingham; Barrow-in-Furness; Tamworth (four); Brighouse; Hull (six); Warton (two); Glascote; Chaseterrace; Norton Canes; Norton East; Dulverton; Porlock; Cannock; Flagg; Chelmorton; Whitehough; Spalding; Holbeach Bank; Holbeach (two); Gedney Drove End; Little London; Cullercoats; Dalton-in-Furness; Aldershot; Wellingborough; Beal; Cartmel; Ulverston; Dartmouth (three); Dawlish; Chelmsford; Harlech; Newton Abbot; Dudley (three); Quarry Bank (two); Gelligaer; Llanbedr (two); Birch's Coppice; Barmouth; Arthog; Dolgelley; Bontddu; Colne (two); Clay Cross (three); Woolley; Lwarth Moor; Timsbury; Unity Tent, Order of Rechabites; South Wales; East Croydon (five); Glossop; Buxton; Compstall; Worcester; Thornton Heath (two); Hallow; York; Chipping Norton; Mynyddislwyn; Abercarn; Yeadon; Burley-in-Wharfedale; Portsmouth; Gorleston; Great Yarmouth (four); Southsea; Bolton (six); Morecambe; Harrop; Leeds (five); Plymouth; Nelson; Manor; Attercliffe; Clitheroe; Barrowford (three); Barley; Wednesbury (three); Tipton; Darlaston; Southfield; Armley; New Wortley; Holbeck; Lower Wortley; Wolverhampton; Street; Glastonbury; Snodland; Onslow Square; Aylesford; Walsham-le-Willows; Rochdale; South Norwood (two); Faversham; Pendleton (two); Buckland Brewer; Thornhillhead; Bideford; Ashton-in-Makerfield; Lynton; Holt; Lutton; Bath; Kimbolton; Westfield; Newcastle-under-Lyme (two); Melindior; Lleckryd; Aberystwyth; Llanbadarn Lower; Bledington; Milton Lodge; Sherston Magna (two); Corsham; Marylebone; Monmouth (two); Blackwood; Broadwell; Freshwater (three); Warminster; Ormskirk; Malmesbury; Seagry; Lea; Great Somerford (two); Garsdon; Hullavington; Brightside; Grimesthorpe (two); Acocks Green; Platt Bridge; Abram; Hindley; Lamberhead Green; Greenock; Melksham; Levenshulme; Upton; Kingsbrompton; Liverpool; Bristol; Swanwick; Bacup; Collingham; Ferndale; Ringley; Little Hulton (three); Bourton-on-the Water; Mickleaver; Bedwellty (four); Houghton-le-Spring (two); Sheerness; Belvedere; Moses Gate; Audlem; Ashton; Worthing; Moulton Seas End; Waterhouse (two); Pemberton; Hayes Lane; Cradley; Hindley; Orrell; Darlington; Greet; Yardley; North Petherton; Birmingham (eleven); Liverpool (two); Rochdale; Little Leigh; Wincham; Whitegate; Over; Middlewich; Baildon; Ilkley; Aberdeen; Redruth; Lanner; Brea; Camborne; Illogan; Rotherham; Morsley Mesnes; Hetton Downs (two); Stow-on-the-Wold; Oakley; Matlock Bank; Topsham; Earlestown; Newton le-Willows; Brynn; Ashton-in-Makerfield; Stubshaw Cross; Saltley; Clown; Middleton-by-Wirksworth; Southend-on-Sea; Great Wakering; Heckmondwike; Littletown (two); High Town; Manchester (two); Dronfield; Poolsbrook; Marsden Moor; Staveley; Widnes (two); Platt Bridge; Merthyr Tydfil; Pontypridd (seven); Landilo; Bradford (two); Ashton; Cromer; Northampton; Nottingham (three); Walthamstow (four); Woodford Green; Ystrad; Croxdale; Trimdon Colliery; Haswell; Biggin; North Walsham; Hickling; Potter Heigham; Freemantle; Neath; Martham; Shipley; Bakewell; Norwood; Kirk Ireton; Thorne; Kimpton (two); Hulland; Ashbourne; Partick; Stroud; Burston; Woodton; Weston-super-Mare; Reading (two); Nunhead; Peckham; Cramlington Village; Seghill; Tywardreath; Combe; Greensplat; Foxhole; Laisterdyke; Ipswich; Amersham; Ferryhill; Tudhoe; Barkby; Syston; Belgrave; Thurmaston; Leicester; Melton Mowbray; Great Harwood; Helmshore; Dumfries; Newchurch; Stroud; Minchinhampton; Threeburrows; Trewartha; Cheltenham; Southwark; Buckley; Rhyndwyclydach; Llansamlet Higher (two); Llansamlet Lower; Gowerton; Liscard (two); Marylebone; Newcastle-under-Lyme; Andover; Greenborough; Sheerness (three); Old Lenton; Sheffield (fifteen); Barrow in Furness; Chapel in the Field; Market Harborough; Dowlais (two); Merthyr Tydfil (three); Vaynor; Aberdare; Baddesley Ensor; Bistre Buckley; Old Radford; Willington; Titney Fen End; Marshland Smeeth; Ryhope; Faringdon; New Ferry; Birkenhead (three); New Brighton; Heswall; Sanghall; Seacombe; East Haybourne; Aylsham; Easthorne; Brenton; Carlton; Hucknall Torkard; St. Thomas; Exeter (three); Repton; Little Over; Plymouth; Dilham; St. Helens; Hemington; Twerton-on-Avon; Radstock; Llandovery; Burry Port; Llandilo; Myddfai; Hastings; Treforest (two); Brightmet; Bolton (two); Enfield; Llanwonno; Ryburgh; Gately; Appleby; Windermere; South Petherton; Tryddyn (two); Ffynnongroew; Soham (four); St. Austell; Irby; Heeley; Darnall; Blackburn; Cheltenham; Croydon (seven); Bradwell; Annfield Plain; Easton; Quicks Green; Burnt Hill; Workington; Hunslet; Belford; Alnwick; Dewsbury; Belle Vale; Garndiffaith; Abersychan; Blaenavon; Gellygaer; Weston Hills; Llanquicke (two); Westwood; Blackhill; Milkwell Burn; Shotley Bridge; East Hedley Hope; Yardley; Micheldever; Bracknell; Swaffham; Baybridge; Sowerby; Norwood; South Norwood (two); Alresford; Nelson; Ancoats; Glasgow; Causeway Green; Walsham-le-Willows; Thornton Heath; Forest Gate; Longtown (two); Silloth; Dalston; Carlisle; Cumwhinton; Faversham (two); Tranmere; Kidlington; Summerstown; Griffithstown; Sutton; and Great Yarmouth; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Llansamlet Lower; Cwmbach (two); Clydey; Aberdare; Llanbedr; Pontypridd; Merthyr Tydfil (four); Llandilo; Llansamlet; Rhyndwyclydach; Llansamlet Higher (two); West Glamorgan; Dowlais (two); Vaynor; Myddfai; Treforest (two); Pontypridd (four); Gelligaer; Rhydfelan; Llanwonno; Bedwellty (two); Brynmawr; Dyffryn; Goginan; Aberystwyth; Pontyberem; Pantgnyn; Mynyddislwyn; and Rhymney; to lie upon the Table.

VIVISECTION.

Petition from Notting Hill, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Chief Inspector for 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Twenty-seventh Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1898. Part I. Criminal Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, appointing Bangor, County Down, an additional place of Examination for Boys [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (GENERAL REPORTS).

Copy presented, of General Report for the year 1899 by the Chief Inspector of the North-Western Division [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham).—Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 220].

2. Arundel Port.—Copy of Annual Report and General Account of the Commissioners of Arundel Port for period from 25th March, 1899, to 25th March, 1900 [by Act].

BEER RETAILERS' AND SPIRIT GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

As amended, considered.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Upon Clause 1 I should like to make one remark. We have not been able to ascertain for ourselves what it means. I understand that a material amendment was made in this Bill during the period of its somewhat private passage through the Committee. I do not see the hon. Gentleman who is in charge of the Bill in his place, but I believe I am right in saying that words were introduced which rendered this Bill inapplicable to any existing licences, and only applicable to new ones. I think that is one inconvenience of a system which has been allowed to continue notwithstanding many protests which have been made against it.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): Upon a point of order. Is the right hon. Gentleman moving an Amendment?

*MR. SPEAKER: I understand from the observations of the right hon. Gentleman that he is about to move an Amendment.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I am going to move the elimination of Clause 1. This is one of the instances where material alterations are made in a Bill during its passage through Committee without any intimation to this House, and when we come to deal with the Bill on the Report stage we find it is upon entirely new lines. Although it is ostensibly the same as that which we were called upon to consider in the previous stages, it has been by these alterations considerably limited and restricted. How does the House stand with regard to precedents which have been established in this matter? This Bill has been presented to us under false pretences. We are asked in this Bill to lay down precedents and alter the law in a way which we should have to keep in view when dealing with kindred subjects. My hon. friend and those associated with him propose to alter the law upon lines which have not hitherto commended themselves to the legislators of this country. The subject is one which has engaged a great deal of attention, and it is most important for the House to carefully consider how far it should deal with the various branches of a great subject in a piecemeal fashion. The system of off-licences is a system of which I entirely disapprove; it was a system introduced by the late Mr. Gladstone, and if the hon. Gentleman who supports the Bill would insert a clause repealing the whole of that legislation by the right hon. Gentleman he would have my cordial support. This Bill, in a very limited manner, proposes to deal with only one branch of the subject, and I am told that this very serious modification of the Bill, which we now see for the first time, was the result of an arrangement. Now, I am always very suspicious of arrangements. By exempting all licences already granted, a very serious departure is made, and the clause as it now stands commits this House to a widely different proposal to that which was originally put before us. I would not take exception to the policy of putting all licences on relatively identical terms, but I do not think the grocers should have advantages which an ordinary publican is denied. I think all those who sell intoxicating drink should be placed on the same footing.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): In the year 1882 my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade carried through this House a Bill which placed all licences in England in the hands of the licensing justices. The ordinary retail beer licences were also brought under the jurisdiction of the magistrates, and that Act was always supposed to relate to Ireland as well as England; but by a decision of the Judges in the Irish Court of Queen's Bench it was held that that Act did not apply to Ireland, and the Bill now before the House has been introduced in order to assimilate the law of Ireland with that of England.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: The hon. Gentleman referred to the Act of 1882. He did not refer to that of 1880, but he confirms me in my impression that nothing in the Act of 1880 or the amending Act of 1882 affected the sale of spirits, and therefore this Act dealing with the retailer of beer for the first time has in it the imported element of spirits. I do not object to that, but I must enter my protest against a subject of this kind being introduced by an irresponsible, or perhaps I ought to say an unofficial, private Member of this House. A subject of this kind, dealing as it does with a large trade, and, what is of more importance, a trade carried on for the public convenience, should not be dealt with in a piecemeal fashion without strict regard to precedent, but should be introduced by an official Member of the House. I beg to move that Clause 1 be omitted from the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I am extremely glad my right hon.

friend has moved to omit Clause 1. It is practically the whole Bill, and his moving its rejection will give us some opportunity of obtaining that explanation which hitherto we have not had given to us in this House as to how this arrangement was come to. An arrangement was come to by which the Second Reading was allowed to be taken, and the Bill then went to the Grand Committee on Trade.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No; it was a Committee of the whole House.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was smuggled through.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I object to the words "smuggled through."

MR. BANBURY: I was not aware that it was a Committee of the whole House; but there is this to be said against Bills of this kind being brought in after twelve o'clock, that unless hon. Members remain in their seats after twelve o'clock they never hear anything about them.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: I hope the House will not agree to place any obstacle in the way of the passing of this measure. This Bill became necessary because of the Act of 1882 not affecting Ireland, and only applies to new licences. An agreement was arrived at with regard to it by both sides of the House, and I trust my right hon. friend will not insist upon preventing us, on one of those rare occasions when Ireland is unanimous, passing this Bill.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I look upon this Bill with a considerable amount of suspicion, because of that very agreement to which the hon. Gentleman has alluded. I innocently took the memorandum as a definition of what the Bill was to do, and I gathered that it was a Bill to assimilate the law of Ireland with that of England, but I now find that is not the fact. It will not create similarity at all, but will create another point of difference in the licensing laws. Another very curious fact is that every Member who holds a copy of this Bill in his hands holds an erroneous copy. There are two Bills, No. 1 Bill and No. 2 Bill, and while one Bill was amended in Committee the Amendments appeared in the copy of the other Bill, so that anybody going to the Vote Office for a copy of the Bill will find nothing in the Bill about new licences. Now the question of old and new licences is one of very considerable importance, and I should like to hear from somebody responsible for this Bill what the position of all beer and spirit licences in Ireland since the decision of the Irish Courts of which mention has been made. There appears to have been a decision by the Irish Courts which held that the Act of 1882 did not apply to Ireland, and that would put all licences in Ireland on a different footing to the licences here. I should like somebody to explain what the position really is. I have no interest whatever in this trade, and have always declined to take any shares in this traffic, but I invite the attention of the House to the words of Clause 1. If hon. Members will look at the clause they will find—

> "1. Notwithstanding anything in any Act now in force the licensing justices shall be at liberty, in their free and unqualified discretion, either to refuse a certificate for any licence for sale of beer or spirits by retail, to be consumed off the premises, on any grounds appearing to them sufficient, or to grant the same to such persons as they, in the execution of their statutory-powers, and in the exercise of their discretion deem fit and proper, and in order thereto shall be at liberty to hear and receive and act upon any objection and any evidence either in support thereof or in aid of the application made or tendered by any resident or owner of property in the parish wherein are situate the house and premises in respect of which such certificate is applied for."

Under this Bill the licensing justices are to decide without evidence at all; but they may receive evidence and act upon it, but it is not to be upon oath. I do not know whether that is the law in England, but if it is, it is a very hard law, and I object to it.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Speaking simply as an Irish Member, and not as a member of the Government, I may say the explanation of the unanimity in Ireland between the trade and the temperance party is this: Owing to a recent decision of the Court of Queen's Bench, the country is liable to be flooded with off-licences, which the magistrates would be bound to grant whether they thought they were necessary or not, and the object of the Bill is to give the same right of objection in the case of off-licences as is given in the case of on-licences. This Bill is supported by all the licence-holders, and I think we might be better employed than in prolonging discussion upon this small matter.

*MR. TOMLINSON (Preston) said that if the clause was to stand, it would be desirable that some modifications should be made in this clause. It appeared to him, from the wording of the clause, that the magistrates might act upon any objection without evidence, but it ought to be enacted that they should not be able to do so unless the objection was supported by evidence. He proposed to move an Amendment in order to test that point.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Amendment before the House is the omission of Clause 1.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I do not wish to stand in the way of my hon. friend if he has an Amendment to propose.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have already put the question, that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

MR. TOMLINSON: Then if no Amendment can now be moved, it is to be hoped that if this clause is passed it will be amended in another place.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I am unwilling to put the House to the trouble of a division, and therefore beg to withdraw my Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

An Amendment made.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

MR. BANBURY: I think there has been some misunderstanding upon this, and I strongly object to the Third Reading being taken.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: This opens up a question going very far beyond the merits or demerits of the Bill. It is now proposed to accumulate two stages of a measure in this House, and that is a matter upon which Members are entitled to express their opinion and signify so far as they can, according to the light of their judgment, if they have the opportunity of deciding. Either the Bill is to be rejected or it is passed in accumulated stages. I object to the accumulation of the stages of a Bill. We used to have the opportunity on the introduction of a Bill of an explanation of its provisions, and of discussing it even at the Report stage. The Second Reading existed as it does now. We further had an opportunity of a motion put to the Chair.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman would hardly be in order in discussing the rules of the House.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I bow to your ruling, Sir, and I will not do more than urge upon the House that it should view with grave suspicion the desire to accumulate the stages of this Bill. I do not object to the Bill on its merits, but I do object to its passing this stage without some explanation, and I think a most dangerous precedent would be established if it is allowed to pass to-day.

*MR. SPEAKER: When the hon. Gentleman speaks about creating a precedent he is mistaken as to a precedent being now created. The same thing has been done over and over again during my time and the time of my predecessor. Two or three years ago the right hon. Gentleman called my attention to this point on a similar occasion, and I then pointed out to him that, in the time of Mr. Speaker Peel, Bills were on several occasions read a third time after a division taken, although a contentious discussion had taken place the same day upon Amendments moved and divided upon. I would point out in this case that the only Amendment that has been made is purely a drafting one.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: Then I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) desired to call attention to the fact that the hon. Members who were so greatly concerned with the passing of the Bill were entirely absent, and that if the Bill were to be read a third time it ought to have the support of those whom it most concerned—the Irish Members. He thought, in the interests of Ireland itself, it would be unwise to prematurely pass the Bill through the House.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): This Bill was brought on at a time when, I regret, I was unavoidably absent from the House, but, so far as I know, this is an absolutely unopposed Bill. Up to within a few months ago the law of Ireland with regard to this matter was assumed to be the same as the law of England, but owing to the decision of the Irish Courts it was held not to be so, and therefore it became necessary to assimilate the law of Ireland to that of England, and so this Bill has already got to a very advanced stage. I trust the House will now read it a third time.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 26; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 149.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Capt.Sir Alex.F
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, Frederick George
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gedge, Sydney
Gold, Charles
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks)
Maclean, James Mackenzie
MacIver, Sir L. (Edinbu'gh,W
Marks, Henry Hananel
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Richards, Henry Charles
Samuel, H. S. (Limehouse)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Whiteley,H.(Ashton-under-L.
Wrightson, Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. James Lowther and Colonel Kenyon-Slaney.

NOES.

Allan, William (Gateshead)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHnGerald W(Leeds
Banes, Major George Edward
Barlow, John Emmott
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach,Rt.Hn.SirM.H(Bristol)
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bill, Charles
Billson, Alfred
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J A (Glasgow
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbysh.)
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Channing, Francis Allston
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colville, John
Cornwallis,FiennesStanleyW.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dewar, Arthur
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Edwards, Owen Morgan
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fenwick, Charles
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Forster, Henry William
Fry, Lewis
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gourley, Sir Edw. Temperley
Graham, Henry Robert
Gretton, John
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Gurdon, SirWilliamBrampton
Harcourt, Rt.Hon.SirWilliam
Hardy, Laurence
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas.H.
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Howard, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez E.
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lafone, Alfred
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumb'land)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Llewelyn,SirDillwyn-(Sw'nsea
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, James
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Monk, Charles James
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Newdigate,Francis Alexander
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Philipps, John Wynford
Pilkington, R.(Lancs.Newton)
Powell, Sir Frances Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt -Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richardson, J. (Durham, S.E.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Rutherford, John

Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Spicer, Albert
Steadman, William Charles
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Edward
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, Alf. (Glamorgan, E.)
Tollemache, Henry James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wason, Eugene
Wedderburn, Sir William
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Willox, Sir J. Archibald
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Wilson, Frederick W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, H. J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Woods, Samuel
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. William Johnston and
Mr. Maddison.

Original Question put, and agreed to. Bill read the third time, and passed.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) EXTENSION BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

*MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.), who had given notice to move "That this House regrets that so many agricultural labourers will be excluded from receiving any compensation for death or injury under the Bill," said the Bill had been considerably altered, and its scope restricted, since the Government had taken it out of the hands of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Lowestoft, who originally had the conduct of it. The Bill originally provided for the agricultural labourers coming within the Act of 1897. By the alteration which had taken place in Committee, through the introduction of the word "habitually" a very large number of labourers would be precluded from the benefits of the Bill. He regretted that the Government should think it necessary to put such a limitation on the Bill, because it would make invidious distinctions and set up two classes of men, one of whom would have privileges under this Bill whilst the other would not, for it was right that agricultural labourers should come within the provisions of the Act, and if that proposition was granted the only way to deal with the matter was to give compensation to all men working on big or small farms, whether by the year or only for the summer quarter. It was said that the burden of paying compensation to all would be too great. If that were so, why did not the Government accept the proposal made by him in the Standing Committee? His proposal was that the owner and not the occupier should be responsible for compensation, and he had been able to show that the cost of insuring against such liability was very small indeed, and would be no appreciable burden upon landlords. He did not propose to move the Amendment standing in his name, but he desired that some explanation might be given by the Government as to why it was necessary to mutilate the Bill originally introduced.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.): The hon. Gentleman began his remarks by complaining that the Bill had not been taken charge of by the Government. I am not aware that the Government have adopted a different position with regard to this Bill from what they always adopt in Grand Committee. I always find that the Minister responsible for a Department to which a Bill refers is present. It was essential that the Government should advise the Committee of the effect of the proposals contained in the Bill. In this particular instance the Government have adopted the same position as in former cases. We received valuable assistance from the Government in the Grand Committee. The hon. Member said there were a large number of agricultural labourers whom the Bill would exclude from the benefits to be conferred. That was an indefinite statement. He gave us no proximate idea of the large number to be excluded, and entirely based his argument on a word which occurs in Clause 1. When the original Act was introduced the Home Secretary told us that he estimated that there were roughly 13,000,000 persons employed in the various trades and employments throughout the country, and he estimated that of that number 6,000,000 would come under the Bill and 7,000,000 would be excluded. In the estimate of 7,000,000 he estimated the number of agricultural labourers at 1,700,000. I have no doubt these figures are proximately correct. I want to know how many of these 1,700,000 are employed by farmers who habitually do not employ workmen during the course of the year. It is necessary that the farmer should employ one or more workmen throughout the course of the year to come within the scope of the Bill. I do not believe that the number to be excluded are any large amount at all. I certainly think that before the hon. Gentleman suggests that my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill is excluding a large number of agricultural labourers he should give us some data to go on. If the hon. Gentleman wishes to make out what a horrible Government this is, and how they have "left" the agricultural labourer, he should go down and explain his case to the constituencies. I would then be able to understand his remarks, but for any other purpose I fail entirely to understand the reason for his observations. I hope the House will agree to this Bill now being considered, and I sincerely trust that we shall make it as good a Bill as it can be made. I do not think it is by any means a perfect Bill.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): It is hardly fair that the Government should be attacked for the limitation which has been inserted in this Bill, because the limitation did not proceed from the Government. I think the first limitation was one of my own in regard to properties of one acre. Immediately after that a great number of further amendments were placed on the Paper. The Standing Committee were almost unanimous that some limitation was absolutely necessary. The only question was whether it should be the slight limitation suggested by myself, or the large limitation suggested by some hon. Members. I do not think we can attack the Government in regard to that matter. At the same time my hon. friend is, I think, thoroughly justified in raising the discussion on this Bill, for it is one of extreme difficulty from the legal point of view, and all who were present at the Standing Committee will be aware of the fact that the House cannot too carefully scrutinise the Bill. We need not discuss whether there has been an undue amount of litigation in the matter. There has been a great deal of litigation, and we ought to take every possible means in our power this afternoon to prevent a recurrence of litigation similar to that which has taken place under the principal Act. This Bill appears to be more than a mere extension of the other Act. The Bill contains two other different uses of the word "workman," both of which are different from the definition in the original Act. If we are not very careful in the wording of the Act there will be a terrible amount of litigation arising out of it. I cannot but regret that this Bill should stand on the paper immediately before the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill. I am personally in favour of that Bill, but those who take part in the discussion of the Compensation Bill seem to be open to the charge that they desire to prevent the discussion of the next Order on the Paper. I can assure the House that is not the case with many Members, who, while deeply regretting the possibility of standing in the way of that measure, are bound, out of regard for the interests of their constituents, to discuss the measure before the House. The Government have assured the promoters of this Bill that they will find time for it; and they seem to attach more importance to it than to their own measures. It would, therefore, be better if they took the Bill into their own hands, so that there should be no failure at this or any other stage. There is another matter that makes it difficult to discuss the Bill to-day. It is the absolute absence of the Irish Members from the House. The Bill affects Ireland in a larger degree than this country. All the difficulties that arise on this Bill are difficulties which will be much greater in the case of Ireland, and yet we are discussing the Bill in the absence of the Nationalist Members. It is a most unfortunate fact that there were no Irish Members on the Standing Committee, and here we are going to discuss a Bill which will have a most extraordinarily close bearing on the affairs of every parish in Ireland in the absence of those who are supposed to be most nearly in touch with the small Irish farmers. The question of limitation we can only deal with on the report stage. The answer to the suggestion that the liability should be thrown on the landlord and not on the occupier is that in many cases the owner and occupier were the same person. In my own constituency there are 3,500 workmen freeholders who would all have been within the Bill as originally drawn. When we discussed the mother Act some of us pointed out how difficult it would be to apply the measure, because unless you have some sort of Government guarantee, State insurance, or State control, you give a merely illusory security. It is impossible to throw the responsibility in certain cases on the owner instead of the occupier, because the owner and occupier are the same man. That is a case for some limitation or exclusion unless you have Government insurance or responsibility which we cannot contemplate in this Bill.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. LONG, Liverpool, West Derby): I do not know whether it is really necessary to speak at this stage on behalf of the Government, because the case for the Government has been put by my hon. friend the Member for South-west Manchester, and by the right hon. Baronet, who has dealt with the subject in another way. It is not quite accurate to say that the position of the Government in respect of this Bill is one of actual responsibility. In the Grand Committee the Government have shown that they are prepared to support it and to make it effective. Where difficulties have existed the Government have suggested alterations in order to remove them, and the suggestions made in the Grand Committtee are in the main accepted, while the Government also undertook to assist hon. Members responsible for the measure in securing such further amendments as would make it clear and workable. I think I may say on behalf of the Government that there is only one desire in regard to the Bill—namely, to make it as comprehensive as it justly and fairly can be made, as well as clear and effective. I am not so afraid as the right hon. Baronet that litigation will be likely to arise from the passing of the Bill. The experience gained from the working of the parent Act has undoubtedly thrown a flood of light on the question of employers' liability, and that question is now in a more satisfactory position than it was previous to the passing of the last amending Act. I do not think that there will be any material difference as to agricultural employment. The assurance societies are prepared to offer reasonable terms to employers for insuring their men, and the liability, therefore, of the employers will be removed from them. The difficulty, no doubt a serious one, will be to bring home to the smaller employers the liabilities which they incur after the passing of the Bill. That is a difficulty which the Board of Agriculture will endeavour to meet by circulating the fullest information as to the effect of the measure. It has been said that the Bill will exclude a vast number of labourers from its operation. I do not believe that anything of the kind will occur. I do not think it will be possible to make the Bill apply to all agricultural employment. Everyone who knows how the smaller kinds of agriculture are conducted is aware that labourers employed in a better class of local employment make it a practice for their own advantage to employ casual labour and to devote themselves to the wage-earning labour. To throw upon one labourer a liability of this kind in respect of casual employment on allotments would, I think, be a great injustice. I agree with what has been said as to the difficulties of the question and the importance of the Bill. I have made it my business, along with the Home Secretary, to consult with those who have placed Amendments on the Paper to clear up doubts and difficulties. We have received the advice not only of the Attorney General, but of the legal advisers of the two Departments, and I have every reason to believe that if the House accepts some of the Amendments the Bill will be made as clear and as effective as it is possible for the Government to make it. I admit that there is a good deal to be said in favour of the criticism of the word "habitually"; but we have not been able to find a better word. It conveys the meaning better than any other word which has been suggested, and without it the Government could not assent to the passing of the Bill. If the application is not limited in this way the result will be to cast responsibility upon a large number of very small people who may have to compensate men no worse off than themselves. This would be a great injustice, because these men are only casual employers for a short period of the year. I hope that the House will see fit to proceed with the measure.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I am sure that the House will cordially accept the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that the Government are prepared to do all they can to give effect to the Bill. I was a little disappointed, however, that the right hon. Gentleman has not given a more favourable reception to the appeal of my right hon. friend that the Government should themselves take charge of the Bill and find the necessary time for its passing. Everyone must feel that this is one of the most important Bills of the session, if not the most important, Its operation will be very wide, and no doubt it is a measure which will lead to a great deal of controversy. The right hon. Gentleman ought therefore to take the responsibility of ultimately passing the Bill, for, after all, it is the Board of Agriculture that ought to be held responsible by the agricultural labourers and the country for the framework of the Bill. They were responsible for the Compensation Bill. There is no doubt that the private Member in this case has performed an extremely valuable duty in bringing to the birth a measure which but for him would never have seen the light. Then the nurse of the Bill ought to be the Government, and they ought to see that the Bill is brought to maturity in a form which will give satisfaction. I know I have been a party to the ousting of private Members from a great deal of their time, but when there is a Bill of this kind which has reached this stage I do think that the right hon. Gentleman below the gangway is right in saying that the Government ought to undertake it. I venture to say that they have no Bill in reserve of anything like the importance of this. This Bill, as my right hon. friend has said, must take a considerable time in discussion. There will be discussion, for instance on the one word "habitually" in the Bill. You cannot expect that these controversies will not take some time. There will be a great deal of difference of opinion on this subject. I confess that I take a very considerable interest in the Bill that is immediately to follow this Bill. I understand that private Members are to be deprived during the rest of the session of Wednesdays, with two exceptions, and I think the time now at the disposal of private Members ought to be relieved of curtailment by the Government undertaking to watch over the further progress of this Bill. If the Government will only undertake the conduct of this Bill, as they have done more or less in the Grand Committee, then, I think, a difficulty will be removed.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I do not agree with the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. This subject is one eminently suitable for treatment by a private Member. It is a question on which both political parties are agreed, and the only thing to do is to so carefully word the Bill as to carry out what we all desire. Surely that is a matter that may be taken in hand by private Members. From my hon. friend's speech, I gather that his opposition to the Bill before the House is based on his opinion, not that so many agricultural labourers will be excluded from the operation of the Bill, but rather that so many agricultural labourers who are interested will not receive compensation. I am one of those who put down in Grand Committee this limitation which has been adopted by the Government. I put it down then and I support it now because of the difficulty which would arise in the payment of compensation by small and occasional employers. These small holders who occasionally employ a man to do an occasional job have no wage bill, and it is no good telling them they can insure against their liability. The premium may amount to only a few shillings on £100 of wages, but where the wage bill does not amount to £100 in ten years any premium would be a very substantial increase to the sum the man has to pay. It is an unfortunate necessity that any agricultural labourer should have to stand outside the benefits of this Act. We might consider whether the number who would be so excluded would be large or small. Such a point does not affect the principle of the matter, but it does affect the practical consideration of the question. In the first place, I doubt very much whether there are a large number of labourers in this country who always work in casual agricultural employment. The hon. Member for South Somerset rather suggests that the men who only casually employ a labourer form the larger part of the farmers. It is almost impossible to call such men farmers at all. The man we propose to protect is a man who is practically a labourer himself. There are hundreds such in every country district; they work one day for themselves on their own allotments or gardens, and the next day perhaps work for their neighbour on his allotment or garden. It would be absurd to say if A was working on the plot of B on Monday and was injured, B should compensate him, whereas if B the next day was working on A's plot and was injured, the compensation should be the other way. It seems almost impossible to adopt such a suggestion as that. But will the accidents in regard to the casual employment of such very small men as that be numerous? I am glad to think that the number of accidents in rural districts is very small compared with the number of accidents in almost any other employment. Agriculture may not be remunerative, but it is more or less safe. If there are accidents they occur mainly from three sources, namely, the use of machinery, the use of spirited horses, or from the liability of men to fall from high stacks or ricks. In the case of these very small men machinery is not employed, so that that source of danger may be excluded from the point we are considering. Nor are their horses spirited. They usually have but one horse, and it is generally of a chastened spirit. I do not suggest that the owner does not take proper care of it, but it has much work to do, and such horses do not bring about accidents by their high spirits. Then the stacks of these men are not high. I wish these men had more to put into their stacks, but as a matter of fact the stacks are not very high, so that that source of danger to the agricultural labourer does not apply. The hon. Member for South Somerset said there was no fund from which compensation could properly be drawn, and he suggested that the landowners should pay. I believe there are some owners who do, as a matter of fact, insure the workmen of their tenants. But I see a very practical difficulty in the case of these casual labourers on very small holdings. Insurance companies base their rates of premium on the wages bill. One fills in a schedule of the amount of wages it is anticipated will be paid in the year, and at the end of the year that is adjusted with the company. If you have paid more wages you pay a little more premium; if you have paid less wages the company makes you an allowance. But how could that be done in the case of a landowner insuring the casual labourers of his very small tenants? He would have to go round and ask every single cottager on his estate how many times he had had A or B to do a job for him and paid him a shilling or two for his services, and the making up of a wages bill would be a matter of considerable practical difficulty. Moreover, if I was a director of an insurance company, which I am not, I should say, "We insure you employers against accidents to workmen, but we rely on your exercising some discretion as to the men you employ." Now, if a landowner indirectly insures the labourer of his very small tenant, he has no control over that labourer. He might be a man whose intemperance was such that it was extremely probable to bring about an accident, and I very much doubt whether insurance companies would undertake to insure owners against accidents to men over whom they had no control whatever. But these poor men, whose case we are considering, will not go absolutely without any help. The great friendly societies of the country provide accident funds, and a man, if he belonged to one of these societies, would be able to go on the funds of his society. It is one of the glories of this Parliament that we have provided so much compensation for so many workmen who are injured in the course of their employment, and that we have done it by encouraging the system of insurance, without injuring the employers. We should, however, be doing harm and not good to the labouring population if we taught them to throw all their cares on the Government and to make no provision for accidents happening to themselves. If any labourer said, "I am so fully insured under the Workmen's Compensation Act that I need not continue my subscription to my club," he would be acting foolishly, because an accident may happen to him when he is working on his own plot or allotment, or when he is not working for anybody at all, and then if he has taken his name off his club he will receive no compensation whatever. The hon. Member for South Somerset says that we should look closely at the words of this Bill. That is very true, especially as regards the third version of the words which has been laid before us for carrying out the object we all desire. I have compared the Bill as brought into this House with the Bill as it left the Grand Committee, and I think there are only about five words in the first operative clause which are in the same position now as when the Bill was read a second time. We have, therefore, an entirely different wording from that which we originally had to consider. I go a step further. If anybody will look at the Amendments on the Paper they will see that the Amendments proposed by the promoters of the Bill will again so change the substance, at any rate, of the wording as to make this a third Bill brought in during the present session. That being so, it is practically before us to consider which of the three wordings carry out our intentions in the best and wisest form. That is surely a matter, considering the greatness of the subject, which might absorb the attention and energy of this House upon this Wednesday afternoon. I am very glad that, whether on account of this or some other Bill, there is so large an attendance on this occasion, because in the multitude of counsellors that I see present perhaps we shall have an accumulation of wisdom. It is an opportunity for getting this Bill into the very best phraseology—a phraseology which even lawyers will understand, so that they will not have to fight over the meaning of it in the Courts; and to get such a phraseology as that will be a very worthy use of a Wednesday afternoon.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): With regard to the small employer, my opinion and experience differ entirely from the view put forward by the hon. Member for Thirsk. The small employer is the man who has the worst machinery, the worst plant, and the most inefficient appliances; and also with regard to the one horse kept by these small employers my experience is different from that of the hon. Member. These men have not means adequate for the proper conduct of their business, and they have to buy horses that nobody else will buy; they have not the money to buy a good horse, so they get a "jibber," and a "jibber" is the most dangerous of all. I would much rather deal with the most spirited horse than with a "jibber." The most terrifying few minutes of my life during recent years were the result of the action of the only horse of one of these small farmers. My life, whatever it was worth, was in great danger, and I can assure the hon. Gentleman that I earnestly wished there were no such horses in the hands of small holders. A man is much safer in the employ of a large farmer than of a small employer. That of a large corporation is always the safest service in which to be engaged. The man serving under a farmer who only occasionally employs labour is under far more dangerous conditions than the man serving under a farmer who habitually employs labour; therefore the only logical course is to omit altogether the word "habitual." But I understand that to attempt to force that is to wreck the Bill. That is the position taken up by the Government, and I am not prepared to do anything calculated to have that effect. If there are any means of improving the measure without endangering its passage I will support them. On this Report stage I shall take precisely the same action as I took in the Grand Committee—namely, that of adopting such policy as I think is best calculated to ensure the passing of the Bill. The sensible appeal made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean does not appear to find favour with the only representative of the Cabinet present; therefore I take it that we must go on with the Bill, for the position is that we must have the Bill to-day or not at all. I am for having the Bill with all its defects. In this Bill, as in most Bills, there are many defects; this Bill to a large degree is full of defects. I entirely adopt the view of the hon. Member for South Somerset, that a very large number of labourers will be excluded from its scope. It is all very well to ask for statistics; it is easier to ask than to supply; but we all know that with regard to the Act of 1897 probably the larger proportion of the workers are outside of it. With regard to this present Bill probably the larger part of the agricultural labourers will come within its scope, but there will yet be a large number excluded. If the Government would agree to the omission of the word "habitual" I think they would make this a better, stronger, and more logical Bill. On the other hand, I recognise the danger of imposing upon a man who is himself only a labourer in degree the fearful responsibility which might be imposed upon him by the omission of the word "habitual"; and that brings me to this one point. In 1897 I expressed the opinion that there would be no final settlement of this question of compensation until a part or the whole of the compensation due to the workers was paid by the State. That is the only resting place, and to that point it will, in my judgment, ultimately come. There is no sound argument against it, and it will be impossible to give the workers full compensation until some measure of that kind is passed into law. I exceedingly regret the exclusion which will occur under these words. An accident is an accident and a loss is a loss, whether it is met with in the service of a poor or of a rich employer. This measure does not do all that we want, but we shall have to take what we can get, and I sincerely trust that such a policy may prevail this afternoon as will see the Bill through in an hour or so, so that we may get on to another interesting subject.

*MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): When the Bill was before the Standing Committee the hon. Member for South Somersetshire and the hon. Member for the Lichfield Division were the only members of the committee who supported the proposal for solving the problem of bringing the whole body of agricultural labourers within its scope, by throwing the liability upon the owner of the land instead of upon the employer; and amongst others, the hon. Members for Leicester, Morpeth, and Battersea voted against this Amendment. They knew perfectly well that such a proposal was inconsistent with the principle of the original Act, which was that the burden should fall upon the employers actually interested, so as to make them feel pecuniarily the responsibility of looking after the safety of those whom they employed. In the discussions on the Act of 1897 representatives of the working men insisted over and over again that their object was not to obtain money compensation, but to secure greater safety of employment. The proposal under discussion would make this Bill not an extension of the Act of 1897, but a reversal of the principle of that measure.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): With regard to the suggestion that exceptional measures should be adopted for the passage of this Bill, there will be plenty of time, if it is found that Wednesday is not sufficient, for the right hon. Baronet then to urge the Government to take other steps. There is no reason to depart now from the usual course and to take a private Member's Bill out of its regular place on the Paper in the midst of the discussion, especially when we have at least three hours for its consideration. I am glad that we have this opportunity of discussing what is undoubtedly an extremely important measure. I am rather inclined to agree that a certain number of workmen will be excluded from the operation of this Bill. I am sorry the hon. Member opposite did not give any statistics or grounds for that supposition; I was most anxious to hear on what he founded that belief. But undoubtedly the inclusion of the word "habitual" must to a certain extent deprive a number of men of the benefits of this measure. In 1897, when the Workmen's Compensation Bill was before the House, I voted against the inclusion of agricultural labourers within the scope of that measure, because I thought that agriculture was in such an extremely bad condition that it would not be able to stand the heavy charges which such an inclusion would involve. Since then we have seen that the cost of insurance is considerably less than was anticipated, and that on the whole the Act of 1897 has worked well. It seems to me, therefore, that we have good ground for bringing the agricultural labourers within the operation of the Act. But if you bring in agricultural labourers at all I cannot conceive why every agricultural labourer should not be brought in. The agricultural labourer employed by a small man may be injured just as seriously as the man employed by the big farmer, but if the word "habitual" is left in he will not get the benefits of the Act. The object is to include all men who are injured in the course of their avocation, and therefore I hope that, if, as I understand, the Amendment to leave out the word "habitual" cannot be accepted, some means may be found by which these men will not be deprived of the benefits we wish to see extended to them. I cannot agree with the suggestion that the charge should be put upon the landowners. The effect of such a course would be to discourage care on the part of farmers in seeing that their appliances were in good order and in doing everything they could to enable their labourers to carry out their work without injury, as there would be no incentive to the farmer to take ordinary precautions. Nor can I agree with the hon. Member for Thirsk that in every instance the poor employer has the best appliances. I rather agree with the hon. Member for Leicester on that point, though I do not believe that the "jibbing" horse is such a dangerous animal as he would have us suppose. I have had several such horses myself, and it is my belief that the "jibbing" can be cured if the horse is treated properly. The absence of the Irish Members has been alluded to and urged as a reason for the postponement of this Bill. The measure has been down for a considerable time, and every Member of the House must have been fully aware that it was coming on to-day. If the Irish Members do not consider the Bill to be of sufficient importance to them to be present, that is no reason why the House should postpone the consideration of the Bill because of their absence.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): I must express my astonishment that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean should have made the remarks he has done. It is only another proof, if proof were needed, that hon. Members sitting on that side of the House have no real sympathy with the working man, but only the idea of punishing owners of property.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE asked the hon. Member in what way he had gathered that impression.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS: I am not to be intimidated by the interruptions of the right hon. Gentleman in any remarks I have to make. I know he has been in the House longer than I have, and on more than one occasion he has interrupted me when I have attempted to address the House, and, as a young Member, of course I feel it very keenly. I am one of those who have always supported the Government and the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies in their efforts from time to time to deal with this question and to extend this principle, but one of the small points upon which I was not in accord with my party was the omission of the agricultural labourer from those who were to enjoy the benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Act. There seems to be a desire on the part of the Opposition to delay the passage of this Bill, and the reason, no doubt, is that, having assented to the Second Reading because it was not convenient to divide against it, they are now, at the present stage, endeavouring to smother the measure in their embraces. The House is absolutely at one in the view that the agricultural labourer ought to enjoy the same privileges as those included within the operations of the present Act, but it would be an extraordinary proposition, and one which finds no parallel in the existing law, that the owner of the property, although he is not the employer, should be made responsible for the accident, because the employer of the person injured is not in a sufficiently solvent position to meet the claims which may be made upon him. One of the most amusing of the reasons put forward to delay the passing of this Bill is that of the absence of the Irish Members. If this House is to delay the passing of beneficent legislation because Irish Members do not think fit to attend, motions for adjournment will be most constant, especially when matters vitally affecting the Empire are brought forward. Personally, I should be the first to assist hon. Members from Ireland if I thought any injustice was being done to them, but I fail to see any legitimate argument based upon the fact of their absence.

MR. ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS: I am delighted to find that there is, at any rate, one Member from Wales who is in earnest on this matter, but if he is really anxious that this measure should be passed into law, I am sure he will not wish to burke discussion upon it, unless he feels that that discussion will tend to open the eyes of the people as to the way in which this Bill is being treated by certain Members of this House. With some experience of the working of the older Act, I am glad to think that the Standing Committee have made this Bill what I may call a short Bill and, as far as Acts of Parliament can be, one that is fairly easy to understand. We are all familiar with the number of appeals which have from time to time been brought before the Courts and carried to the final Court of Appeal at great expense to the working classes. I must express the hope that nothing will induce the Government to alter the view they have expressed as to "habitual" employment. In my opinion that word is a most material portion of the measure, but it might be well that that word "habitual" should be dealt with in some explanatory way, otherwise there will probably be some expensive test case with regard to the matter. When we deal with the question of the servant of the small employer, who is in some counties the first person to be considered, I do not see how he can look or hope for inclusion. Unfortunately the tendency in all departments is for the small man to be pushed out. With all respect to the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, his remarks with regard to State insurance are quite beyond the subject. We have not yet come to a position in this country when State insurance can be undertaken, and all we can do is to ensure for the agricultural labourers the same privileges as are possessed by the workmen in towns. The provision in Clause 1 that the occupier shall be deemed to be the undertaker within the meaning of the Act is, I venture to think, as far as this principle can be carried, and if it is carried out in a spirit of perfect justice to the workman and a spirit of equity to the small employer of labour in agriculture, the latter will suffer no more than the small employer of labour in towns is suffering, and must naturally suffer, under this Act if his machinery is deficient. As a lawyer I object to what I may call loose and careless drafting which will lead to a great amount of unnecessary litigation. I should like these points dealt with in an explanatory clause, so that the County Court Judges may have some idea of what the legislature in its wisdom meant. Lord Justice Smith, in dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Act, has made some remarks which are the reverse of complimentary to the wisdom of Parliament. [Opposition cries of "Hear, hear!"] I am glad to find that there are hon. Members on the opposite side of the House who agree with Lord Justice Smith in the attention which he has drawn to this question. I would suggest that the House should deal fully and clearly with the words and specify clearly what is meant. With regard to the 15th line of the Bill the expression "workman"——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is following a rather unusual course in discussing all the Amendments on the Paper upon the motion that this Bill be now considered.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS: I will not dwell further upon that point, but on behalf of the London Members and of those who take a great interest in this principle, I trust the House will, without further delay, agree to the Amendment which has been moved.

Question put, and agreed to. Bill considered.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: When this Bill was before the Standing Committee on Trade, at the conclusion of the proceedings of that Committee I asked the senior Law Officer of the Crown whether the word "workman" which appears in line 6 and line 9 meant the same thing in each case, and he said there was a very considerable difficulty in the interpretation of the word, and he was doubtful whether it meant the same thing in the second case as in the first, and he promised to consider that point.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): When was that statement made?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: It was at the conclusion of the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Trade that I raised this point. For the purpose of asking a question upon this point as to the meaning of the word "workman," I propose to move an Amendment to leave out the word "workman" at the end of line 6 and insert the word "labourer." The word "workman" is employed in line 6 to define the persons who are to receive the benefit of the Act. In line 9 the word "workman" is again used, but in a different sense, for there it provides for persons who "habitually employ for hire one or more workmen," and those persons are to be deemed employers from whom compensation may be claimed. My first question is whether it is the intention of the Government that the word "workman" should mean the same thing in the first case and in the second case, and whether the word "workman" shall have one meaning in the whole of this Bill. In line 15 there is a definition of the word "workman," which provides that "the expression 'workman' in the case of agriculture, means every labourer in agriculture." I understand that the motion is to be made to leave out those words. It is also provided that this Bill is to be read as one with the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, but in that Act the word "workman" means something quite different from what it means at common law. In that Act the term "workman" includes persons who obtain their living "by manual labour or otherwise." That provision immensely extends the definition of "workman," as it has hitherto existed. The words "or otherwise," which are to be read as one with this Act include clerks in the employment of firms, and I should like to know if that is the intention in this Bill. Possibly the courts might interpret the words in a different way. I want to know whether the word "workman" has the same meaning in line 6 as it has in line 9, where it is again used. In the first case you are dealing with the man who obtains the advantage of the Bill, and in the second place you are dealing with the man who has to pay compensation under this Bill. When I put this question on the Standing Committee on Trade I put a concrete case. In the cider industry there are people employed in pressing. The small occupier takes apples from other persons and manufactures them into cider, and he employes workmen really in a workshop, and who are not workmen engaged in agriculture under the words contained in line 15. Are those men to be included in the term "workmen" in line 9? That is a plain question with a plain concrete illustration. This Act is to be read as one with the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, and there the definition of "workman" is different to that given at common law. My contention is that three different meanings are attached to the word "workman"—one by the original Act, one in line 6, and another different one in line 9. This matter is one so vital to the working of this Bill that it ought to be cleared up and placed beyond all doubt, because it is probable that lawyers with the definition of "workman" contained in line 15 would construe the word "workman" as meaning something different in lines 6 and 9. It is an important point, because the wider the meaning of the word "workman" in line 9, the wider will be the effect of this Bill. If you limit it to workmen employed in agriculture the measure will be much narrower in its operation.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 6, to leave out the word 'workman,' and insert the word 'labourers' instead thereof."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'workman' stand part of the Bill."

MR. GRANT LAWSON: When this Bill was before the Grand Committee I looked up a great many books of law to ascertain the various terms that could be used. I understand that the right hon. Gentleman's proposal is to leave out the word "workman" and insert the word "labourer."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: No. I am quite indifferent as to the word used, and I have merely suggested the word "labourer" for the purpose of raising the question.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: If the word "labourer" is adopted it will lead to very great confusion indeed. I find that in the case of Morgan v. The London General Omnibus Company a labourer is described as—

> "A man who digs and does other work of that kind with his hands. A carpenter or a bailiff, or a parish clerk is not called a labourer."

It is obviously intended that a bailiff should come under this Act, and if the word "labourer" is left in the Bill a bailiff would be excluded from the benefits of the Act. In the case of Lowther v. Radnor, Chief Justice Ellenborough decided—

> "Neither would a labourer include a skilled artisan, there being, as I take it, a distinction between a journeyman in any art, trade, or mystery, or other workmen employed in the different branches of it, and a labourer."

Then, again, it was stated in the case of The Queen v. Sibrishi that—

> "It is doubtful whether the word 'labourer' in the Sunday Act extends to an agricultural labourer."

So that it is clear that the word "labourer" seems to have troubled the Courts, and if you put in this Bill the word "labourer" it will certainly be brought up again for the reconsideration of the Courts. There is one expression, however, which has been interpreted by the Courts, and the House will agree that we should try to get a definition which has been before the Courts. If we do that we shall get a judicial opinion without having to pay for it. The expression "servant in husbandry" occurs in a great many Acts of Parliament; it occurs in the definition of "workmen" in the Employers' and Workmen's Act of 1875, in the definition of "workmen" in the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, and in the Truck Act of 1887. So that it is an expression with which the Courts are familiar. In one case quoted in Stroud's Judicial Dictionary the definition given of a "servant in husbandry" is—

> "A person, whether male or female, whose chief employment is in the work of husbandry—that is, the culture or keeping of the ground, or the management, or working of horses or cattle, or the gathering in of crops or any other work strictly pertaining to the manual labour required by farmers. Therefore a farm bailiff is not, but a dairymaid, who also does household work, is a servant in husbandry."

That is a judicial decision given in the Queen's Bench, and which would guide any future Queen's Bench decision. I venture to suggest to my right hon. friend the Attorney General that he should consider whether it would not be as well to adopt in this Bill the expression "servant in husbandry."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: I think my hon. and learned friend who has just spoken has given conclusive reasons against the introduction or retention in the Bill of the expression "labourer." It is highly undesirable to have any definition like that in this Bill, lest we raise again in the Courts disputes regarding its interpretation. I cannot say, however, that my hon. and learned friend has converted me to the proposal that he has made in regard to the phrase "servant in husbandry." He began with a quotation from a most interesting and valuable work by Mr. Stroud, a work on the English language employed by Judges. The expression "servant employed in husbandry" has received definition from the Courts several times; but we are now dealing with the principal Act of 1897, and surely it is much better to retain the expression which is defined by that Act, and which it is fortunate has not yet given rise to any controversy. I think everyone in this House, whether lawyer or layman, will agree to retain an expression which has that recommendation. In answer to the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, I have to say that of course the Bill is subject to amendment at the hands of the House on Report stage, and the ultimate construction of the Bill must depend on the way it emerges from the Report stage. But assuming that the word "labourer" is to be eliminated from the Bill, I should say that the word "workman" in the Bill will be read as in the principal Act, for this Bill is to be read along with the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: In both cases?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: Yes, in both cases. There "workman" includes "every person who is engaged in an employment to which this Act applies, whether by way of manual labour or otherwise, and whether his agreement is one of service or apprenticeship or otherwise, and is expressed or implied, is oral, or in writing." The limitation would be if he is a workman employed in agriculture, and that means that agriculture is his principal employment. In regard to a workman engaged in making cider, if the person was an agricultural workman engaged in the operations of agriculture, and only on occasion used in the manufacture of apples into cider, he would fall under the section as it probably will emerge from the Report stage. His principal employment would be agriculture; his employment in cider-making would be only occasional. If, on the other hand, the person was not employed in agriculture, but was engaged in the manufacture of the cider, he would not be an agricultural workman within the meaning of the Act.

Mr. GALLOWAY: Then the expression in line 16, "every labourer in agriculture," will go out of the Bill?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: Yes.

*Mr. TOMLINSON (Preston): The idea of the Government now is to leave the definition of "workman" as it stands in the principal Act?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Yes.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I may say the object I had in view in formally moving the Amendment has been attained. The reading of the Attorney General is an improvement on what I understood in the Standing Committee. I beg to ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes): Objection was raised in the Grand Committee to the clause as it stands at present, on the ground that it might apply only to farmers and might not include landlords and other persons, and that it might not bring all classes of employment in agriculture within the Bill. I therefore move, as an Amendment, to leave out the words "the occupier of any farm or premises used wholly or in part for the business of agriculture who habitually employs for hire one or more workmen, and any such occupier shall be deemed an undertaker within the meaning of that Act" (the Act of 1897), and to substitute the words "any employer who habitually employs for hire one or more workmen in such employment." I propose to substitute the term "employer" instead of "occupier," as it will remove these doubts. On the Second Reading both sides of the House recognised the desirability of doing something to safeguard the interest of the small man against the operation of the Bill—the man who is little better off than the agricultural labourer himself. The Government in committee proposed to limit the liabilities to the employer who "habitually" employs, and no one has proposed any other word which will limit less the scope of the Bill. I sincerely hope that the House will accept my Amendment, which, while it safeguards the small man who employs another workman once or twice a year, includes all the larger class of employers.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out from the word 'by' to the word 'Act,' in line 10, inclusive, and insert the words 'any employer who habitually employs for hire one or more workmen in such employment.'"—(*Mr. Goulding.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the occupier' stand part of the Bill."

MR. GALLOWAY: My hon. friend's Amendment will take out the whole definition of "undertaker," which is very important. In the original Act the "undertaker" in every particular trade is defined.

*MR. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston): It is to be hoped that the House will not accept the Amendment, because it will make a complete alteration in the construction of the Bill, and its effect will be very far reaching. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment has forgotten that this Bill, when passed, is to be read with the principal Act. The Amendment would exclude the operation of the general definition of the word "undertaker"; and the consequence would be that a large portion of the provisions of the original Act which it is intended to apply to agricultural labourers would be absolutely meaningless and inapplicable.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): I do not quite see how the acceptance of the Amendment would very materially alter the Bill. The object of my hon. friend in proposing the Amendment is to restrict the operation of the Act to a certain extent. It is quite clear that by the Bill as it at present stands compensation might be exacted at the hands of certain employers of labour who are themselves more in need of, and deserve, compensation than to be called upon to pay it. I hope the House will accept the Amendment.

COMMANDER BETHELL (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): There is nothing more certain than that persons who do not habitually, but only occasionally, employ labour will not insure against the possibility of accidents, and if an accident did occur it would be very serious for them. We have got to deal with people as they are, and not as they ought to be. My hon. friend, in proposing his Amendment, seeks to remove a blot on the Bill. I do not quite know whether the phraseology is right—whether we ought to say "usually" or "habitually." It seems to me that "habitually" either goes too far or not far enough, and some other word might be employed.

MR. CRIPPS (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I hope that this Amendment will be adopted, as it will extend the scope of the Act, and get rid of undesirable technicality.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I quite agree with my hon. and learned friend that the effect of the Amendment will be to extend the operation of the Bill. For instance, suppose land is in the occupation of a tenant but the timber is reserved for the landlord, and the landlord is having his timber cut, that would be an operation of agriculture within the intention of the Bill. But, if we retained the Bill as it came from the Standing Committee, it would be impossible to say that the landlord who employed the men to cut the timber was in the occupation of the farm, so as to be liable if any accident took place. By getting rid of the expression "occupier" we get rid of a host of difficulties. Take another case. A man who has bought a growing crop on a farm is not an occupier when he sends men to reap it. Other cases of doubt might be suggested, but sufficient have been quoted to show that there is something to be said for the proposed Amendment. The principal Act deals with employers, and uses the expression in the first section that "the employer shall be liable to pay compensation." But when you come to the end of the Act the employer is defined as meaning the undertaker in respect to certain enterprises—railways, factories, quarries, laundries, mines, and buildings. The reason of that is obvious. The scope of the Act of 1897 was, for reasons sufficient to Parliament, limited to these particular undertakings. The reasons for adopting the language of the original Act in the present Bill are overwhelming.

MR. S. T. EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid): I agree with what the Attorney General has said, that the language of the Amendment is much better than in the clause as it stands, because it extends the operation of the Bill. The learned Attorney General did not deal with the last three words of the Amendment, "in such employment," which seem to me to restrict the operation of the Act somewhat. The right hon. Gentleman says that the word "workman" in line 9 was intended by the Government to be wider than that in line 7.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: On the contrary, I said the interpretation of the word "workman" would be the same in both lines, and the same as is defined in the principal Act.

MR. S. T. EVANS: I understood the Attorney General to say in answer to the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean that it would be better to preserve the term "workman" in line 9 because it would have a more extended meaning than in line 7.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: What I said was that the word "workman" was used in the same sense as in the principal Act, and that it would include persons engaged in agriculture who do not work with their hands.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): The Amendment as it stands does two things: it turns "undertaker" out of the Bill, and puts in "employer" instead of "occupier." If "undertaker" is turned out of the Bill, a deal of reconstruction will be required, and something like Clause 4 of the original Act in regard to contractors will have to be introduced. For instance, if an owner of property employs persons to erect fences or gates, surely these ought to be included within the scope of a Bill like this, but they would not be in the Bill as it at present stands.

Question put and negatived.

Remaining words omitted.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. STRACHEY: My object in moving to leave out "habitually" is to make the clause wider, and not to restrict the advantages to be derived under the Act to agricultural labourers on big farms, and to prevent even on big farms the exclusion of men who thatch, drain, and do other work which is not by its nature continuous. When discussing the Bill earlier in the day the objection to this state of things was met by saying that we were only dealing with cases where a labourer employs another labourer, but hon. Members who use such an argument are only trifling with the House. If they are really sincere in what they profess is their object, let them put in, as they could easily do, words which will strictly limit the operation of the Act to such cases. In numberless cases men are only employed on farms during the summer time in the hay and corn harvest, and these would be excluded from receiving compensation for death or injury under this Bill.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'habitually.'"—(*Mr. Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'habitually' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

*MR. LONG: I hope the House will not accept this Amendment. Although the hon. Gentleman says it is quite easy to find words to express the limitation, he does not assist the House by proposing such words. The hon. Gentleman suggested that there was a lack of sincerity in the hon. Members who support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Devizes. I think the hon. Gentleman is rather carried away by the excess of his devotion to the interests of the agricultural labourer, and this leads him to disregard the just interest of the agricultural employer. I must say that if this Bill were carried in its present form, a grave injustice would be inflicted upon the smaller class of agricultural employers who are in many cases no better off, from a financial point of view, than the labourers they employ; and that injustice would outdo any benefit the Bill would give to the agricultural labourer. If a claim for compensation were brought against, say, a small farmer with only three or four acres of land, who occasionally casually employed a labourer, it would result in the ruin of the unfortunate man, and there would be a popular outcry against the measure. If this is to be a really beneficial measure there must be a limitation. An obvious difficulty arises in regard to the fact that a man is sometimes employed on purely agricultural work, and at other times on not purely agricultural work. My hon. friend thinks, and the Government agree with him, that these workmen ought to be granted compensation when an accident occurs, whatever the employment they are engaged in at the moment; but there must, in justice, be a limitation. I have no particular admiration for the word "habitually." The Attorney General has carefully considered this, and has sought to find some word that would be agreeable to the House, and more suitable than "habitually"; but no one has as yet succeeded in getting such a word. The hon. Member for Holderness has suggested the word "usually," but I do not know that the word "usually" would be better than "habitually." The word "habitually" means the case where a master is in the regular course of employing labourers on his farm. It does not follow that he employs the same man from the 1st January to the 31st of December, but that it is his regular business as an agricultural employer to have labourers on his farm, and he ought in that case to have the same liability in regard to injuries as other employers of labour. On the other hand it would exclude men who only want assistance occasionally for a day or two. That is the best suggestion that has been made, and I hope the Committee will agree to the Amendment.

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Hereford): My objection to the word "habitually" is that a small farmer will be unable to find an insurance company to insure him against the risk of injuries to a labourer whom he cannot define, or about whom he can give no information as to where and when he is to be employed. There are hundreds of small employers who would be ruined if casual labourers were brought within the scope of the Act; and it is absolutely necessary that the word "habitually" should be retained.

MR. WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): As to the statement of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down that insurance companies would not insure against injuries to occasional labourers, I believe that that is not correct, and that insurance companies will insure such cases. [AN HON. MEMBER: The minimum premium is 5s.] That puts the possibility of insurance within the means of small men. Words have been suggested over and over again to protect the small employer, but this not only protects the small employer, but it cuts out a very large proportion of the agricultural labourers throughout the country, and curtails the Bill in a way never originally intended by the promoters. That will be the effect in various parts of the country. There are cases in which a farmer who works his farm with the assistance of a son or two takes on men during the harvest, and in such cases it would be a great hardship if the labourer did not get the benefit of the Bill. As originally introduced it contained none of these curtailments, but the Government and the Minister for Agriculture have nursed it, with the result that it is now restricted as far as it possibly can be. These clauses were not introduced by the promoters of the Bill, but by the Government, who, while professing themselves anxious to carry the Bill, are endeavouring to curtail it as much as possible. I hope my hon. friend will persist in his Amendment, and that he will receive the support of hon. Members on the other side who do not desire that the Bill should be restricted to a small number of agricultural labourers.

COMMANDER BETHELL: May I ask the Attorney General if he thinks in the case of a small employer who does not employ men ordinarily, but only during certain seasons of the year, that the Courts would interpret the word "habitually" so as to bring him within the scope of the Act?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I do not think so. I do not think that occasional employment at a particular time of the year would constitute habitual employment.

COMMANDER BETHELL: Not even if it happened every year?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I do not think that would be habitual employment, even if it happened every year.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 150.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Aird, John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Arnold, Alfred
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baillie, J. E. B (Inverness)
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Banbury, Frederic George
Banes, Major George Edward
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Barry,Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Beach,RtHon SirM.H.(Bristol
Beach, WWBramston(Hants.)
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Biddulph, Michael
Bill, Charles
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles,Capt.H.F.(Middlesex)
Brassey Albert
Brown, Alexander H.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Campbell,RtHnJ.A.(Glasgow)
Carlile, William Walter
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbysh.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Chelsea, Viscount
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H.Athole
Cooke,C.W.Radcliffe(Heref'd)
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Cornwallis,FiennesStanleyW.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. E. T. D.
Courtney, Rt.Hon.LeonardH.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalbiac, Colonel Philip Hugh
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Donkin, Richard Sim
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas-Pennant, Hon. E. S.
Doxford,SirWilliam Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHnSirJ (Manch'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Fry, Lewis
Garfit, William
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Gretton, John
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hardy, Laurence
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Edward B. (Hampst'd)
Hobhouse, Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jackson, Rt.Hon.Wm.Lawies
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence,SirEDurning-(Corn.
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)

Lea, Sir T. (Londonderry)
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn,SirDillwyn-(Sw'ns'a
Long,Col.CharlesW (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowther,Rt.Hn.James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Henry Hananel
Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Morgan,Hn.Fred.(Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mount, William George
Murray,Rt HnAGraham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robt. Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington,R. (Lancs,Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett,RtHnHoraceCurzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell,Gen.F.S.(Cheltenham
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Shaw-Stewart,M.H.(Renfrew)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, William(Derbys.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Sir H. M. (Lambeth)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw.Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Usborne, Thomas
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby,Lt-ColA.C.E.(Tauntn)
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C.Vernon-
Whiteley,H.(Ashton-under-L.
Williams,JosephPowell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.N.
Wrightson, Thomas
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Goulding and Mr. Pretyman.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bainbridge, Emerson
Baker, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, SirCharles(Glasgow
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Carew, James Laurence
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dewar, Arthur
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Owen Morgan
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Saml. T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gold, Charles
Gourley, Sir Edw. Temperley
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir William B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Holden, Sir Angus
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kay-Shuttleworth,RtHnSir U
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Sir Leonard
M'Crae, George
Maddison, Fred.
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mather, William
Montagu, Sir S. (Whitechapel)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. J. (Montrose)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
Oldroyd, Mark
Percy, Earl
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Briggs
Reckitt, Harold James
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, J. (Durham, S.E.)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair,CaptJohn(Forfarshire
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Souttar, Robinson
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Steadman, William Charles
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas,Alfred(Glamorgan,E.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whiteley, George (Stockport)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Williams, John Carvell(Notts.
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Woods, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Strachey and Mr. Courtenay Warner.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W): I should like the Attorney General to consider what the words "employs for hire" mean. Take the case of a farmer who works a farm of 150 acres, and who has no regular servants in his employ, but is assisted by two sons residing at home, who take the place of farm labourers. They receive no fixed wages as remuneration for their services, but they get board and lodging and clothes and a small sum from time to time as pocket money. If I understand the Bill aright, that farmer would not come within the scope of the Bill. Take a second case—that of a farmer with an adjoining farm of smaller size. He has got one boy in regular employment, and it seems to me that unless the words "employs for hire" cover the case of the farmer with one or two sons we may find ourselves in rather an anomalous position after the Bill becomes law, because a man who works a farm to the extent which necessitates the employment of two regular labourers would not come within the scope of the Act, whereas a man with a smaller farm would. That seems to me to be a substantial objection, because I take it that the object of those who are in favour of the Bill is to extend the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Act to as many agricultural labourers as possible.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Clearly the words "employs for hire" mean employment for wages, for hire means money. They would exclude a case in which assistance was given, although habitually, by sons living with their father at the farmhouse. That would, no doubt, be habitual employment, but not employment for hire unless they were taken on for wages.

MR. S. T. EVANS: I think the answer of the Attorney General renders it necessary to move that these words be omitted. The object of the Bill is to give compensation for workmen's injuries, and if we have the case of a large farm on which possibly two sons are constantly employed, although not for wages, why should they be precluded from obtaining compensation if they are injured? The case is a perfectly simple one, and I think the arguments are overwhelmingly in its favour. I beg to move to leave out the words "for hire."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'for hire.'"—(*Mr. S. T. Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'for hire' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I am no lawyer, but it is perfectly apparent that these words ought to be left in, because according to the Act a certain proportion of the wages is to be given to an injured man, and if he gets no wages how can he get any compensation?

MR. S. T. EVANS: That does not refer to the injuries to sons, but to injuries of workmen employed on the same farm.

MR. JEFFREYS: The hon. Gentleman wishes to introduce the sons.

MR. S. T. EVANS: Oh, no!

MR. JEFFREYS: It seems to me perfectly clear that these words "for hire" would limit compensation to men in receipt of wages.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): May I put this case to the Attorney General? Suppose we take a farmer who has two sons habitually working on his farm, but not working for hire; suppose at the busy season, such as the harvest, he takes on additional hands, and during the harvest an accident unfortunately happens to one of them, what will be the position of that labourer? There is no one habitually employed by the farmer, because the two sons are not regarded as labourers working for hire. In the case I have suggested what would be the position of the injured man? Under the Bill, clearly, it seems to me he would have no claim whatever. That is manifestly unfair, and I hope it is not the desire of the Government that it should be the case.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: May I, by permission of the House, answer the question? I agree with the view expressed by the hon. Gentleman. As the Amendment stands at present, unless one or more men are habitually employed for hire, the Act would not apply in the case of a man assisting during a season of the year.

MR. GALLOWAY: I should like to ask the Attorney General whether this Amendment would be affected by the words which I have placed on the Paper —"not being his father or son." Would not that meet the case?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No; unless there is employment for hire.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid): I hope the Government will see the necessity of accepting this Amendment, otherwise there will be this anomaly: You will have two farms of the same extent, one of which is worked by the farmer with the assistance of his sons and the occasional employment of a labourer; while in the other the farmer has to employ two labourers habitually. Because the first farmer has two sons who are not employed for hire, he is not to come within the Act, whereas the other farmer is. I submit that that would be a most glaring inconsistency. I hope the Government will accept the Amendment, as it would simplify the Bill and make it more just.

*MR. LONG: I hope the House will be willing to agree to the suggestion that these two words should be omitted. I think they constitute a practical difficulty and one which would involve a departure from the standard we have suggested. I think the difficulty would be well met by the adoption of the Amendment, subject, if I may say so, to the Government giving their careful consideration to the removal of these words in order to ascertain that their omission would have no further effect than that desired by the mover of the Amendment —namely, to put a man working a farm with the assistance of his sons in the same position as a man working a farm with hired labour. That does not go beyond the original intention of the Bill.

COMMANDER BETHELL: I would wish to ask the Attorney General to consider whether the point raised by the hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division would not be covered if, after the word "habitually," the following words were added, "or at regular seasons." Perhaps the Attorney General would be good enough to give the matter attention when the Bill is under consideration in another place. Words of this kind would meet the points which have been made.

*MR. LONG: I do not think there is any necessity to introduce the words suggested by my hon. and gallant friend.

MR. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon) said he desired to point out that the words "for hire" in this clause were intended primarily to confine the benefit of the principal Act to the paid workman. It had now been objected that the indirect effect of those words, occurring where they did, would be to exclude all but paid workmen from being taken into consideration in estimating the position, importance, and responsibility of the employer. It might be well to strike out the words where they had that effect and insert them at a still earlier point in remodelling the clause, which would then run, "From and after the commencement of this Act the Act of 1897 shall apply to the employment for hire of workmen in agriculture."

Question put and negatived.

MR. S. T. EVANS: As I intimated earlier, I will now move the omission of the words "in such employment." I have solid ground for doing so. It is obvious to anyone reading the clause that the insertion of these words will limit the benefits of the Bill very much. I should be very glad if this Amendment had been moved by the promoter of the Bill. I am not at all sure that when these words come to be construed in a court of law they may not be held to mean employment of the particular class or kind in which the accident happened to the workmen. That would enormously limit the benefit of the Act. If these words are left in we may, perhaps, have a man employing a very large number of persons in another employment, and very well able to pay compensation, escaping. These words were not in the Bill as it passed upstairs, and there is no reason why they should be in the Bill now, and I hope the Government will see fit to omit them.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'in such employment.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

*MR. LONG: I hope the House will not accept the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman. I do not think it is correct to say that the adoption of these words involves a departure from the Bill as amended upstairs, or indeed from the intention of the promoters of the Bill. I have carefully followed the debates, and, as I understand it, the intention of the promoters is that the Workmen's Compensation Act should be extended to agricultural labourers as a body. The Amendment would have precisely the opposite effect to that stated by the hon. and learned Gentleman. The words which the hon. and learned Gentleman says will bear a certain interpretation are clear enough. I am not a lawyer, but my right hon. and learned friend agrees with that view. The intention of the Bill is to apply the Act to agricultural labourers, and I therefore hope that my hon. friends who are responsible for the introduction of the Bill will not approve of the suggestion of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite.

Question put, and agreed to.

Words, as amended, inserted.

CAPTAIN PRETYMAN (Suffolk, Woodbridge): Before moving the Amendment which stands in my name, dealing with the question of contracts, I may be allowed to give two or three instances to explain its effect. There are three classes of cases concerned. In the first case, which is common in the east of England, a certain number of the hired men on a farm form themselves into a gang under the leadership of one of themselves, and contract with the employer to carry out the work of the farm, the employer giving them the necessary machinery. In the second case, a similar gang of men, not usually employed by a particular employer, such as sheep-shearers, contract to do work. In these two cases the labourers are banded together for the purpose of taking a contract, and it is certainly desirable that a man who has taken a job by the piece instead of by the day should not be excluded from obtaining compensation for injuries. It is very desirable that these two cases should be included. In the third case the conditions are entirely different. It refers to a man, generally a large contractor, who is in the habit of lending out steam plant, such as threshers, ploughs, and other agricultural machinery. He employs highly paid men to work the machinery. They are not really agricultural labourers, but are in charge of the machinery, and execute work on various farms in a district, being usually assisted by the farm labourers employed by the farmer himself. In this case it certainly appears desirable that the farmer should not be liable for compensation in the case of injury to the servants of the other man, who is probably a good deal better off. Of course any man employed by the farmer himself should be compensated by him. That appears to be a reasonable way of dealing with the matter. In regard to this particular Bill, it is quite evident that there is complete agreement as regards the principle, but when questions of verbiage arise as to whether a particular Amendment would carry out the intention desired, there is great difference of opinion. I think this Amendment, with one slight alteration which I propose to add, would carry out the principle which I have just laid down. It is divided into two sub-sections. The first sub-section deals with the first two cases I referred to—the cases of contracts entered into by the labourers themselves; and the second sub-section deals with the case where a contract is entered into by a farmer to have his work carried out by machinery. I should wish to add to the Amendment as it appears on the Paper, after the word "contractor," the words "provides and." It is very necessary that the contractor should provide the machinery as well as use it. With that explanation, which I think sufficient for the purpose, I beg to move the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of Clause 1, to add, '2. Where any such employer agrees with a contractor for the execution by or under that contractor of any work in agriculture, Section 4 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, shall apply in respect of any workman employed in such work as if that employer were an undertaker within the meaning of that Act. Provided that where the contractor provides and uses machinery for the purpose of threshing, ploughing, or other agricultural work, he, and he alone, shall be liable under this Act to pay compensation to any workman employed by him on such work.'"—(*Captain Pretyman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid): I think we should have some intimation as to the views of the Government on this matter.

*MR. LONG: Certainly. I did not rise, because I thought my hon. friend, in moving the Amendment, had really covered the whole ground. In a case where the farmer contracts with another man to do agricultural work of the class referred to in the proviso, the other man should, we think, be responsible for any accident to the man he employed, for it would be manifestly unjust to throw upon the farmer the burden of compensation in such a case, where he chose to adopt that system of getting his work done. In the same way where an employer employs his own machinery for the purpose of threshing, it would be unjust that he should escape the liability for injuries to his own servants.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the second part of the Amendment seemed to destroy the first part. He was not an agricultural professor, but he did wish to assist the House, and he thought it would be well if the point he had suggested were considered.

MR. GALLOWAY: But is it so?

*MR. LONG: Certainly not. The clause deals with two totally different kinds of contractors.

MR. MOULTON: I quite sympathise with the object of the clause, but I am afraid that when a court of law gets hold of the word "machinery," difficulties of interpretation may arise as to what really constitutes "machinery." It is most important that the second part of the clause should be restricted to the case of the opulent person with a large capital vested in agricultural machinery, which he lets out. Will the Government consider whether they cannot introduce some words to qualify the word "machinery"?

MR. LONG: I shall be glad to consider that.

Question put, and agreed to.

*SIR CHARLES WELBY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): I beg to move the Amendment which stands in my name. I raised this question upstairs, and the President of the Board of Agriculture appeared to recognise the importance of the point. I have hopes, therefore, that he will accept this Amendment, for I feel sure that its effect will be to do away with some of the criticisms which have been given expression to to-day. The object of the Amendment is to bring within the scope of the Bill a class of cases which are excluded from its operation as it now stands. I feel it is unnecessary that these restrictions should be left in the Bill. They seem to be unwise, and eminently calculated to produce friction and litigation, which everyone recognises should be avoided as far as possible. Under the Bill as it stands a genuine agricultural labourer might meet with an accident, but unless he were engaged upon strictly agricultural work, he would not be entitled to compensation. It is a not uncommon thing for a labourer to be taken off his regular farm work in order to do some special job, for instance to quarry stone to be used in the erection of some church or chapel, or to cart coals for a parish charity. And should he be so engaged at the instance of his employer, he would, if he met with an accident, have no claim to compensation. Now, I think he should be protected in such cases. I will take another illustration in which hardship might arise. The labourer might be directed to drive his master's wife to a neighbouring town. If she was going there in connection with agricultural business, and an accident occurred to the man, he would, of course, come within the scope of the Bill. But if, on the other hand, she was merely going away for a holiday, then the man would have no claim to compensation. I can imagine nothing more certain to lead to misunderstanding and litigation. Having accepted the principle of compensation, the sound method seems to be to define the genuine agricultural labourer, and then to entitle him to compensation in the case of accident, whether the work on which he may be employed at the time of the accident be strictly agricultural or not. I understand, on good authority, that the widening of the scope of the Bill in the way I have suggested will not make any difference to the rate of insurance at which companies are prepared to insure employers. I believe their attitude is one of preference for the widening of the Bill, in order to simplify the matter and to obviate possible litigation. I believe the same argument will appeal to employers. I beg to move.

Amendment proposed—

"Clause 1, page 1, line 10, after 'Act,' insert 'Where any workman is employed by the same employer mainly in agricultural but partly or occasionally in other work, this Act shall apply also to the employment of the workman in such other work.'"—(*Sir C. Welby.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. LONG: I hope the House will accept this Amendment. I think it only carries out principles which have already been laid down.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: Can the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that a man shall not be excluded from the benefit of the Act by reason of the fact that the accident occurs off the farm? I believe that under the original Compensation Act it has been decided by the Courts that in the case of a shipbuilders' yard the liability to compensation——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That hardly arises on this Amendment.

Question put and agreed to.

MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I have to move an Amendment to render liable, under this Act, all persons who keep horses. I daresay it carries the Act rather further than has been intended. I certainly think that livery stable keepers should be brought within the operation of the Bill. Many of these establishments have no land attached to them, but they consume a good deal of agricultural produce, and I wish to bring these, as well as hunting establishments, under the operation of the Bill.

*MR. LONG: I do not think the Amendment will serve the purpose aimed at. This Bill deals with premises used for the purpose of husbandry, and, obviously, livery stables would not come within that definition.

MR. CAWLEY: But surely husbandry includes the keeping of live stock?

*MR. LONG: It means the use of land for the ordinary purposes of stock or crop raising.

MR. CAWLEY: But the produce consumed in these establishments comes off the farm, and, therefore, I ask, will not people employed in the livery stable come under this Act?

*MR. LONG: Certainly not.

MR. CAWLEY: Well, my Amendment is designed to bring them under the Act, and I therefore beg to move it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, after the word 'land,' to insert the words 'or premises.'"—(*Mr. Cawley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or premises' be there inserted."

*MR. LONG: The Amendment will not secure the object aimed at by the hon. Member. This is a Bill which proposes to extend the benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Act to labourers employed in agriculture. Men engaged in livery stables do not come within that definition, and if we were to concede the point raised by the hon. Member the Bill might at once be made to apply to the whole community, simply because it consumes agricultural produce. These men are not in any sense agricultural employees, and their case therefore cannot be dealt with in a Bill which is solely intended to extend the benefits of a certain Act to agricultural workmen. I hope the hon.

Gentleman will not insist upon his Amendment.

MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.): May I ask how this Bill will affect men employed in market gardens which are covered by glass?

*MR. LONG: Market gardeners are engaged in horticulture, and agriculture includes, among other things, horticulture.

MR. CAWLEY: I ask leave of the House to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR CAMERON GULL (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I wish to move the omission of the last three words of Sub-section 2. I do so because they are very vague and might give chances for litigation.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 14, to leave out 'and the like.'"—(*Sir Cameron Gull.*)

*MR. LONG: I think my hon. friend is quite right. It is undesirable to retain words which might be capable of a loose construction.

Amendment agreed to.

SIR CAMERON GULL: I have another Amendment of a drafting character, and I believe that earlier in the day the desirability for making it was admitted.

Amendment proposed,

"In Clause 1, page 1, leave out from beginning of line 15 to 'agriculture,' in line 16."—(*Sir Cameron Gull.*)

Amendment agreed to.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): The Amendment which I have to propose has for its object to insure that in the case of an agricultural labourer who meets with an accident in the course of his employment, although he may not be actually engaged on the farm work, he shall not be excluded from the benefits of this Act. It appears to me it is necessary that we should insert a safeguard of this kind; otherwise the compensation provided for under this Bill will be of a very limited character. I am told that my Amendment as it stands on the Paper is rather too wide, and I propose it, therefore, in a rather different form.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'agriculture,' to insert the words—'A workman employed in agriculture shall not be excluded from this Act by reason only that the accident arose outside the farm or premises of his employer in the course of his work.'"—(*Captain Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. LONG: This Amendment extends the Bill to all kinds of accidents which may befall all kinds of agricultural labour. I would point out that it is not really necessary. In the original Act the liability is closely connected with the premises on which the industry is conducted. But in this Bill there is no connection between the accident and the place of employment. All that is necessary is that the employer shall be an employer in agriculture, and that the man shall be a servant also employed in agriculture. Wherever, therefore, the accident takes place the man will come within the purview of the Bill so long as the conditions I have named obtain. There is, therefore, no necessity for the addition of these words.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: After the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman, I beg to ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. GOULDING: I beg to move the Amendment which stands in my name. In a recent decision in the High Court it has been laid down that a man who has not been in continuous employment for fourteen days is outside the scope of the parent Act. Now, it certainly was never contemplated by Parliament that such a rule should be laid down, and I have drafted an Amendment the adoption of which will ensure that a similar injustice is not created under this Bill. The men affected are very often the poorest, and are therefore the most deserving of protection, and I cannot possibly understand how it can be held that men who are in a certain employment for four, five, or six days shall not be entitled to the same protection as is granted to other men who are fortunate in being longer employed. I understand that no difficulty would arise with the insurance companies through the adoption of this Amendment. They do not require the names of the employees; they only ask that they shall be supplied with the total number of men employed and the amount of their wages, and they are quite willing to take the risk, for they are assured that no master would allow any man to apply for compensation unless he was entitled to it. I hope that the Government, who have already done so much for social reform, will accept this Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'agriculture,' to insert the words, 'The expression "average weekly earnings," in the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, shall, for the purpose of this Act, be deemed to mean six times the workman's average daily wage during his employment with the employer in whose service he shall sustain personal injury by accident, although he may not have been so employed for a period of two weeks prior thereto.'"—(*Mr. Goulding.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. LONG: I regret extremely that my hon. friend has thought it necessary to move this Amendment. It is obvious that any proposal on our part to accept it would lead to prolonged discussion. It may or may not be desirable to include what is called "casual labour" within the purview of the Bill. But if it be desirable in the case of agriculture, it is still more so in other industries where such labour is employed to a far greater extent. Personally, I should be disposed to offer strong resistance to the acceptance of this Amendment dealing with the matter in this limited form. But it is impossible now to enter upon the merits of the proposal, and as I am very desirous that the Bill should pass through the Report stage this afternoon, I appeal to my hon. friend to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid): I would like to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that this Amendment does not relate solely to casual labour, meaning men employed a day or two. It affects men permanently employed. It has been decided in the Appeal Court that where a miner is engaged in Lancashire at 6s. a day, on the second day of his employment he is not a casual labourer. I believe the framers of the Act of 1897 intended that, however short a time a man may work for his employer, he should benefit by the Act. It was not intended that he should first work a complete fortnight, although it has been laid down in one case that an average weekly wage cannot be fixed unless the man has worked a full fortnight. I hope this matter will be pressed to a division.

*MR. H. S. FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I rise to make an appeal to my hon. friend to withdraw this Amendment. I hope he will not allow it to be said that he, as one of the promoters of the measure, talked it out. We have had some very valuable concessions from the Government, and I would point out to my hon. friend that he will have an opportunity of again raising his question, if he wishes, by moving to re-commit the Bill on the motion for its Third Reading.

MR. GOULDING: I ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Title amended.

Bill to be read the third time on Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 257.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I have an Amendment to move to this Bill. It will be remembered that when, through some misunderstanding, it obtained its Second Reading, I intimated that it would be necessary to introduce some very important Amendments, and this is the first of them. [Opposition cries of "Agreed!"] Hon. Members opposite may cry "Agreed," but I am not sure that Members on this side of the House are agreed, and it is their opinion which I wish to obtain. I believe the adoption of the Amendments which I have drawn will make the measure harmless and even desirable ——

It being half-past Five of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday next.

CRUELTY TO WILD ANIMALS IN CAPTIVITY BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time and passed.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LOCAL VETO) (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS AND GUARDIANS (TERM OF OFFICE) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Seventh Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—CAPTURE OF THE TA-KU FORTS, ETC.

On the Motion for Adjournment:—

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I wish to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether he can give us any news from China.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I am afraid we have very little news. There is one telegram to the Admiralty, a portion of which is already in possession of the House It is from Rear-Admiral Bruce, at Ta-ku, viâ Chifu, dated 20th June:—

"17th June.

"Ta-ku forts captured by allied forces this morning. Bombardment commenced 12.50 a.m.; ended about 6.30 a.m. Details later on. Chinese admiral present with allied fleet. Flag flying in cruiser. At council meeting this morning he agreed to anchor with fleet, putting out fires.

"18th June.

"No news from Commander-in-Chief and advanced guard. Tientsin now cut off; heavy fire heard there last night; 3,000 Russian troops under major-general here. My communications with allied authorities most harmonious."

With regard to the heavy firing at Tientsin, a telegram has been received at the Foreign Office from the British Consul at Tientsin, viâ Chifu. It is dated 20th June, but it may perhaps have left Tientsin on the 18th. It is to this effect—

"Boxers last night did much damage to line north of Tientsin and burned Roman Catholic cathedral, mission chapel, and great number of Chinese houses. Chinese troops made no visible effort to restrain them. On their attacking settlement foreign guard killed about 100."

We have no later information.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 21st June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

St. Albans Water.
London and North Western Railway (Wales).
Devonport Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

DORKING WATER BILL [H.L.].

FISHGUARD WATER AND GAS BILL [H.L.].

MENSTONE WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [H.L.].

NEWPORT CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

NEWTOWN AND LLANLLWCHAIARN URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

BUENOS AYRES AND ROSARIO RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

COSTA RICA RAILWAY COMPANY, LIMITED, BILL [H.L.].

Read 2^a.

BRADFORD CORPORATION BILL.

BAKER STREET AND WATERLOO RAILWAY BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

GREAT GRIMSBY STREET TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

RAMSGATE CORPORATION IMPROVEMENTS BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

CHARING CROSS AND STRAND ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

Standing Order No. 93 considered (according to Order), and dispensed with, with respect to a petition of the Corporation of London. Leave given to present the said petition.

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [H.L.].

The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

MORECAMBE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (GAS) BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee without amendment.

MARKET WEIGHTON DRAINAGE AND NAVIGATION BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 18th and 25th of May last discharged; and Bill committed.

CHRISTCHURCH AND BOURNEMOUTH TRAMWAYS BILL.

BLACKPOOL, ST. ANNE'S, AND LYTHAM TRAMWAYS BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 116.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 1) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

Read 2^a (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

The asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (PETERSHAM) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRAINING COLLEGES.

Reports on training colleges for the year 1899, by W. Scott Coward, Esq., the Hon. Mrs. Colborne, and Sir John Stainer; list of training colleges under inspection.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Twenty-seventh Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department.

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).

Eighteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1899: Part III. Scientific investigations.

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Part I. Criminal Statistics for the year 1898.

FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Annual Report of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, for the year 1899.

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).

Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1899, by the Hydrographer.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE OBSERVATORY.

Report of the Astronomer at the Cape of Good Hope Observatory to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, for the year 1899.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, for the year 1899.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

No. 527. Agricultural and other natural resources of Tripoli.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION.

Statement of the estimated income and expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation for 1900-1901.

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Account of receipts and payments under the Act during the year ended 31st March, 1900.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

1. Rules and programme of examinations for the year 1901;

2. Rules made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing Bangor, county Down, an additional place of examination for boys in 1900.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ARUNDEL PORT.

Account and Report for 1899-1900. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PETITIONS.

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition in favour of; of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

STATUE OF OLIVER CROMWELL, AT WESTMINSTER.

Petition for the removal of; of persons singing; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Message from the Commons for leave for the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House. Leave given accordingly, and a message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

BEER RETAILERS' AND SPIRIT GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL. (No. 114.)

CRUELTY TO WILD ANIMALS IN CAPTIVITY BILL. (No. 115.)

Brought from the Commons; read 1ᵃ; and to be printed.

VOLUNTEERS BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I was under the impression that the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War did not intend taking the Committee stage of this Bill until Friday, and therefore I have not put down the Amendmend which it was my intention to move. I will, however, move it in the Standing Committee. The effect of my Amendment will be to leave out Sub-section (*b*) of Clause 2, and, of course, to consequentially amend the former part of the section. The noble Marquess explained to the House on a former occasion that he considered it desirable that Volunteers should be called out for active service within the limits of the United Kingdom. I do not object to that, but, for the reasons I gave on a recent occasion, I think it very undesirable that Volunteers should be called upon to give an undertaking to serve outside the United Kingdom before circumstances arise which justify a special call for their services.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): I understand that the noble Lord does not intend to press his Amendment on this occasion, and therefore I scarcely feel justified in taking up your Lordships' time in commenting upon it. In our view it is desirable that we should place it within the power of Volunteers to assume, if they so desire, a liability for service beyond the limits of the United Kingdom. They have done so lately with great distinction to themselves, and in our view it is not likely that they will consent to deprive themselves of the power of rendering similar services should the opportunity hereafter arise. If that be so, it is clearly our opinion that we should be put in a position to make the necessary arrangements with such Volunteers not at the last moment and in a hurried fashion, but deliberately and beforehand. That is the reason we have inserted this provision in the Bill, and I confess I should be very sorry indeed if your Lordships decided to get rid of it.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I adhere to the opinion I have already expressed, and I should have preferred to see both (*a*) and (*b*) omitted from the clause. I object to them on general grounds—as altering the character of the Volunteer force, as likely to give rise to embarrassment hereafter, and as totally unnecessary, in my opinion, for the purpose which the noble Marquess has in view.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Other clauses agreed to; Bill reported without amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

MILITARY LANDS BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1:—

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The clause as it now stands would render it impossible to set in motion the machinery of the clause on behalf of a rifle club. It is felt that this restriction would be undesirable, and my Amendment removes it.

Moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 8, to leave out 'by or on behalf of a Volunteer corps.'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: This clause, as at present worded, obliges a Volunteer corps, as well as a county council or any other local authority, to apply to the Local Government Board for leave to borrow. That is a very proper condition in the case of a local authority, but I do not think that it should apply in the case of a Volunteer corps. Under the Military Lands Act of 1892 Volunteer corps must apply to the War Office for permission to borrow, and in our opinion the War Office would be a better judge in cases of that kind than the Local Government Board.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 9, to leave out from 'and' to 'may' in line 11, and to insert 'for this purpose.'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 3:—

LORD MONKSWELL: To this clause I have to move a drafting Amendment of very considerable importance. It is not my own, but Lord Thring's. Lord Thring would have moved it himself had he been able to be present to-day. On looking through Clause 3, Lord Thring was quite unable to satisfy himself of the effect of the clause as it at present stands. Your Lordships will see that it is a case of legislation by reference run mad. In the first place, certain provisions of Section 9 of the Local Government Act, 1894, are to apply; but they are to apply with certain modifications. Those modifications refer to other Acts, and if those Acts are looked at it will be found that they in their turn refer to previous Acts. The consequence is that anyone who reads this section will have considerable difficulty in understanding what the procedure is. Lord Thring suggests that it is exceedingly desirable that Her Majesty's Government should lay down in the schedule the rules of procedure which they consider are applicable to this case. They will have no difficulty in doing so if they understand Clause 3, which Lord Thring is unable to do. I would suggest that before the next stage of the Bill, or in the Standing Committee, the noble Marquess should produce a schedule describing in detail the procedure he proposes.

Moved—

"In Clause 3, page 2, line 4, after 'purposes' to leave out to the end of the clause and insert 'the regulations contained in the Schedule hereto as to the confirmation and otherwise of the resolution mentioned in this section shall apply in the same manner as if they were re-enacted in the Act.'"—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: No one has more respect for the high authority cited by the noble Lord than I have, and it is quite true that we all occasionally complain of the abuse of what is generally described as legislation by reference. I am afraid the offence, if it be one, is committed rather indiscriminately by all of us, and for very obvious reasons. The noble Lord has moved to insert the words—

"The regulations contained in the Schedule hereto as to the confirmation and otherwise of the resolution mentioned in this section shall apply in the same manner as if they were re-enacted in the Act."

But he has left it to us to provide the necessary schedule. I have made some inquiries as to the probable character of that schedule, and I am told that it would be one of considerable length, covering four or five pages of printed matter. That would greatly add to the bulk of the Statute-book, and I submit that in this case it is scarcely necessary. I am told that the procedure to be followed under these two Acts—the Local Government Act, 1894, and the Allotments Acts, 1887—is very well understood, and that an exhaustive recapitulation of all the clauses would be superfluous. I have an Amendment to the same clause which will perhaps deprive it of some of the ambiguity to which the noble Lord has referred, and I certainly prefer my Amendment.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): The noble Lord is setting a very bad precedent. In order to render the Amendment intelligible, anyone voting on it must have the schedule before him; but we are asked to vote on the Amendment without in the least knowing what the schedule is to be. I hope the Amendment will not be adopted.

LORD MONKSWELL: My proposition is that at the next stage of the Bill the schedule should be set out, and the House given an opportunity of considering its provisions. Surely the four or five pages of printed matter to which the noble Marquess has referred might be lessened by some modified and perfectly intelligible reference to statutes that are easily accessible. But if it is the case that the Government cannot make the meaning of the clause clear to the ordinary mind under four or five pages, then that is an additional reason why those pages should be set out. I may mention that Lord Thring placed this Bill before the Parliamentary Committee of the County Councils Association yesterday, and that the committee passed a resolution recommending that the procedure clauses should be set out in full in the schedule.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I agree strongly with the Amendment of my noble friend. This is the most outrageous case I have heard of. It is most extraordinary that a Bill of this kind, involving very considerable dealings with land, should be passed through Parliament without the procedure being clearly set out. And why, forsooth, is this to be done? Because it is so complicated that it will take the War Office a long time to make it clear. How, I ask, is the ordinary reader to understand it without the assistance of those gentlemen in the War Office who, whatever may be their qualifications on military matters, are perfectly able to prepare a schedule of this kind? I hope the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who has frequently spoken against the practice of legislating by reference, will persuade his colleagues to give the public some assistance in understanding this Bill.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: May I ask whether it is likely to add to the value of the precedent you are endeavouring to set up, to enact that there shall be a schedule of some sort or other without describing it?

LORD MONKSWELL: I suggest that the noble Marquess should withdraw these words from the clause with a view of producing a schedule at some future time.

On Question, their Lordships proceeded to a division.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am very anxious not to keep back from persons interested in this Bill any information with regard to the manner in which it will operate, and I suggest, as a possible solution of the difficulty, that we might print and lay upon the Table of the House——

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I am afraid the noble Marquess is out of order in speaking now.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY): The noble Earl is quite right. There can be no speaking after a division has been called.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): All we have to do is to withdraw the division and proceed.

On the Question being again put, the Amendment was negatived.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: There is now no reason why the noble Earl should not allow my noble friend to make his statement.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: We refrained from dividing in order to enable him to have an opportunity of making it.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The suggestion I was going to throw out was that we might make the position perfectly clear, without encumbering the Statute-book with a schedule of inordinate length, if the clauses of the two Acts which affect the clause in this Bill were printed and laid upon the Table of the House for your Lordships' consideration. It would then be for your Lordships to judge whether it was necessary to do anything more or not.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I think that suggestion perfectly reasonable.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4, 5, and 6 agreed to.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: The new clause standing in my name after Clause 6 has been introduced at the instance of my noble friend Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and is designed to render the Act applicable to Scotland. I must take it from him that the Amendment is sufficient for the purpose. I cannot pretend to be sufficiently conversant with the mysteries of Scottish law to affirm that it is so from my own knowledge.

Moved—

"To insert as a new clause, after Clause 6:—'(1.) In the application of this Act to Scotland the following provision shall have effect—(*a*) The expressions "council of any urban district" and "council of any urban district other than a borough" shall mean the commissioners of a police burgh; (*b*) the expression "Public Health Acts" shall mean the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, provided that the limit of rate imposed by that Act shall not apply to any rate authorised by this Act; (*c*) the expression "hire" shall mean "take on lease"; (*d*) references to the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, and to Section 25 and Sub-sections (2) to (4) and (7) to (9) of Section 26 thereof shall be substituted for references to the Local Government Act, 1894, and to Section 9 and Sub-sections (2) to (5) and (8) to (10) thereof respectively; (*e*) a reference to Sub-section (8) of Section 25 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, shall be substituted for a reference to Sub-sections (1) and (5) of the Local Government Act, 1888; (*f*) in Section 6 of this Act the expression "Local Government Board" shall mean the Local Government Board for Scotland. (2.) In Sub-section (9) of Section 25 of the Military Lands Act, 1892, "twenty-one" shall be substituted for "twenty-two."'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, new Clause agreed to.

Clause 7 agreed to; Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be reprinted as amended. (No. 117.)

UGANDA RAILWAY BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: My Lords, this is a Bill to increase the sum provided for the construction of the Uganda railway, the expense of the work having exceeded the estimates which we made for it. But this is so common a failure with respect to the prophecies of surveyors, architects, and engineers that it has almost come to be regarded as a matter of right that their estimates should in some degree fall short of their ultimate expenditure. I am not, however, going to plead any right of that kind in the present instance, though I hold that the universal practice for many generations has established the fact that surveyors and engineers may exceed the estimates they have laid down. There is no need for me to appeal to that unhappy experience. The first Bill was passed under very peculiar circumstances. It was deliberately passed by Parliament without there being that survey which is invariably undertaken before any railway is begun. There was a survey executed under circumstances of great difficulty, and with great ability, by Major Macdonald, but it was not a survey such as is generally made in such a case. Most of the ground was not even travelled over, and some of the circumstances necessary to be known in carrying through the work were not even ascertained. But Parliament were perfectly well aware of what it was doing. They perfectly well knew that it was a railway undertaken without such a survey as is usually carried through before a work of such magnitude, or, indeed, any railway work at all, is undertaken. For instance, the character of the labour market, the opportunities that there were for obtaining the requisite number of workmen, the cost at which they could be obtained, the nature of the soil with reference both to its operation upon steel sleepers and its action under the pressure of tropical rains and hurricanes, and many other matters, which a more elaborate survey would have cleared up, were left without being fully or even considerably investigated. Anyone who reads the report of Sir Guilford Molesworth will see that this statement is fully borne out by him. Then it may be asked why we undertook a railway without a preliminary survey. My answer is that we did so with a perfect consciousness of what we were doing, and for the sake of speed. There is no doubt that if we had gone through the usual process many more years would have passed before there was any chance of completing the work; and anybody who remembers the political condition of the country at that time will not find it difficult to realise that there were considerations of a very cogent character which induced us to desire to finish, at the earliest period possible, what was practically our only access to these regions. At that time the battle of Omdurman had not been fought, the occupation of Fashoda had not taken place, the very wide-reaching agreements which we have since made with the French Government had not then been discussed, and our position was one which I will not say was critical, but our position was one of very considerable difficulty if any serious embarrassments with any European Power had arisen before we had done anything to make our military access to the place easier than it naturally was. I doubt whether anyone will challenge the soundness of that reasoning, and I will not pursue it, because it leads into many matters which are not precisely suitable for discussion. If the railway was to be made, one of the great objects why it should be made was to give us military access to the country; and therefore it was important that it should be made with as much speed as possible. On these grounds we undoubtedly entered on the railway without that complete and exhaustive survey which under other circumstances would have been proper and suitable; but I do not think that any great harm was done. There is no doubt that the sanguine views which were entertained have not been carried out, but many things have happened which we had no reason to anticipate. The native labour market to a very great extent proved useless, and we were compelled to go to the Indian labour market, which was itself enormously embarrassed by the famine and pestilence with which that country has been visited. The use of cattle in the country was very seriously impeded by the outbreak of rinderpest, which raged with such fury over all those territories. One of the first necessities in constructing a railway is to have an adequate supply of machinery, and when that necessity was pressing upon us the most strongly there come the engineers' strike in England, which arrested the supply of machinery for a considerable time. There were many other difficulties which it may be said we might have foreseen, but which we could not have altogether foreseen, and which had the effect of considerably raising the price. I observe that in another place a railway was cited for our example—namely, the Beira Railway—which had been completed at a somewhat cheaper rate; but the citation was an unfortunate one, for the Beira Railway has turned out so supremely ill-made that it has had to be almost entirely recast, and I doubt very much whether in the end it will be found to have been constructed at a cheaper rate than we propose to assign to the Uganda Railway. Although there is good ground for the speed at which we constructed the railway and the comparative absence of precaution, there has been no financial disaster. The railway is now advancing rapidly, and as soon as the great work of the Mau escarpment has been overcome—it requires engineering arrangements of a peculiar character, but the difficulties, I believe, are now very nearly overcome—the line will reach the lake with great rapidity; whether in the course of next year or not I do not know. The expert evidence seems to show that that will probably be the case; but, at all events, we are very near the end, and I am sure that when the railway is completed it will be an enormous engine for the civilisation of the country. On these grounds, my Lords, I hope there will be no objection on the part of this House to give its assent to the measure which the House of Commons has passed, by which the amount assigned shall be raised from three millions to nearly five millions.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, no doubt at first sight the amount demanded by this Bill appears extremely startling. It is very rare that an estimate is exceeded to so large an extent, and, on the face of it, it appears to be a very serious matter. I agree, however, with the noble Marquess that it was highly desirable, as we were in possession of Uganda—a question which is now beyond discussion altogether—that without loss of time railway communication with the coast should be established, and that there were many reasons—some of which it is not desirable to enter into—which made it extremely unsafe that we should have no means of communicating with that distant possession. I think that it was not without justification that this project was set on foot without that detailed survey which undoubtedly would have been made under other circumstances. What I would like to know is whether the Government are of opinion that they are now in possession of such complete information that they can with confidence say that the present estimate is not likely to be exceeded. I gathered, from reading some time ago that very able Report to which the noble Marquess referred, that there had been a very large change in the whole direction of the railway towards the Lake, and that that had involved a great increase in the cost. I suppose those who projected the railway and framed the estimates hardly took into consideration the presence of a considerable number of lions, who ate up a number of the coolies employed. Looking at the cost of the railways in India during the time I was connected with the administration of that country, and considering the difficulties of the country through which this line had to pass, I do not think that the amount is very excessive. In ordinary circumstances I would be inclined to say that it was, of course, a scandalous thing to ask Parliament for a sum of three millions and then to add two millions, or nearly two millions, to that figure. But, as I have already remarked, this case must be judged in a different way, and only those who are well aware of the very peculiar conditions under which we held the country can rightly estimate the matter, and I will not say the excuses but the reasons why it cannot be regarded as a subject for censure. All I wish to do, therefore, is to ask whether the Government are now in possession of satisfactory information enabling them to say that the sum at present fixed will be sufficient.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am afraid I can only tell the noble Earl that I am told so. I cannot pledge my own knowledge of engineering as a ground for believing that it will be so, but those with whom I have been in communication are quite of opinion that the sum named will cover the expense. Of course, the unknown plays a considerable part in this matter. It is the part of the railway which is furthest from the coast that is less known, and there may be embarrassments and difficulties which we cannot foresee. But, speaking my own conviction, I have little doubt that what we are now asking for will be enough. With respect to the lions, I feel bound to say something in their behalf. They are not so aristocratic that they will only feed on coolies; they took a medical man the other day, and I expect it will be found that they have taken many other people. The noble Earl indicated that in consequence of our not having had a survey we were compelled to take a longer route than we otherwise would have done. That is not so.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I did not mean to imply that. I do not know that the answer of the noble Marquess exactly gives me the information for which I asked. What I wished to know was not so much whether the noble Marquess himself was of opinion that the estimate was sufficient, as whether there had been such an examination of the country, especially the difficult new country which has to be passed through, as would make the estimate formed probably a correct one.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I do not think I would be doing right if I pledged myself. Undoubtedly, the part of the country referred to has been very little investigated yet; but, according to the opinion of competent persons, the estimate ought to be sufficient.

On Question agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House to-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

THE CROMWELL STATUE.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the erection of a statue of Oliver Cromwell within the precincts of the Palace of Westminster without the consent of Parliament; and to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to a speech of the First Commissioner of Works in the House of Commons, on 23rd February,[†] in which he laid down as a doctrine of Constitutional Law, that in the case of the erection of a statue upon which no public money is spent, the First Commissioner of Works is under no obligation to consult Parliament as to the acceptance of the gift or as to a site; and, if so, does the doctrine hold good even when the opinion of Parliament has been expressed against the proposed statue or site. I hope your Lordships will forgive me for bringing to your notice a matter which I know is considered by many people to be past and done with. But there are circumstances resulting from it which, in my opinion, are very far from being past and done with. Your Lordships will observe that I have prefaced my question by asking to be allowed to call attention to the erection of a statue of Oliver Cromwell within the precincts of the Palace of Westminster without the consent of Parliament. I have done so for the following reasons:—First, it is only the facts in connection with this statue which render intelligible the point on which I am going to ask the Prime Minister for enlightenment; and second, I am anxious to take this opportunity of explaining why I have not followed up the Motion I carried in your Lordships' House in October last by a further Motion. I am aware that the effect of the division I took on that occasion was discounted by the press and only too plainly by Her Majesty's Government, and, perhaps, with your Lordships' permission, while I am referring to this point I may be allowed to allude to what may be considered a personal matter. I have a painful recollection that on the occasion referred to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack characterised the Motion I brought forward as not calculated to add to the dignity of your Lordships' House; but I hope your Lordships will believe that it was very far from my intention to do anything disrespectful. The circumstances were peculiar. It was only when the pedestal on which the Cromwell statue now stands reared itself into view that any one realised the intention of Her Majesty's Government, and petitions came in from all parts of the country. I have a list in my hand of 274 petitions which, I believe, have been presented to Her Majesty's Government protesting against the erection of this statue. The only opportunity I had of protesting was by putting down a motion. Parliament was about to adjourn, and I put down my motion with the sole object of getting Her Majesty's Government to consent to defer the putting up of the statue until the re-assembling of Parliament in the coming year, when both Houses of Parliament would have an opportunity of expressing their feelings and their opinion on the matter. Her Majesty's Government decided to ignore the division that was taken in this House, and on a dark November morning the statue of the great Protector was stealthily unveiled by a workman representing, I presume, the First Commissioner of Works, and without one word of panegyric. It is true that on the same evening a demonstration was held to celebrate this unique and interesting ceremony. I am informed that the anonymous donor of the statue addressed the meeting, but, of course, I have no authority to say so. I eagerly scanned the names of those present on the platform in the expectation of finding the name of the First Commissioner of Works, if not that of the Prime Minister himself. It is strange that not one single member of Her Majesty's Government was present, and I think it is a significant fact that of the party that supports Her Majesty's Government the names of only two members were on the list—one a Unionist Peer, and the other a Conservative Member of the House of Commons who himself had signed a petition protesting against the erection of this statue without the previous consent of Parliament. I fully intended to have drawn your Lordships' attention to this singular proceeding before, but at the time I thought of doing so the very serious aspect of affairs in South Africa led me to think that it would not be convenient to raise the question. Unfortunately, Mr. Swift MacNeill did not share that opinion, and he brought the matter forward in the House of Commons by moving an Amendment on the Vote for the maintenance of the Royal Palaces.* I regret very much that episode, but I think it is worthy of note that the matter was brought forward wholly unexpectedly, with the result that Her Majesty's Government got a very large majority, but in the minority were many Members of the House of Commons who usually support the Government. Thereupon I put down the question on the Paper, which I should have asked the Prime Minister some weeks ago had I not unfortunately been laid up, and unable to attend your Lordships' House. On the occasion of the debate referred to, the First Commissioner of Works stated that it had never been the practice of his Department, when a statue was paid for by public or private subscription and not out of public funds, to consult Parliament. That claim, my Lords, does not square with the statement made by the noble Lord, Lord Churchill, who represented Her Majesty's Government when I brought my motion before the House in October last. Lord Churchill said:—

[†] See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxix., p. 956.

---

* See Vol. lxxvii., page 749.

* 23rd February, 1900. See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxix., page 949.

> "The understanding on which the work [the statue] was to be executed was that a suitable site, satisfactory to the donor and to Parliament, should be given by the Government."

I was astonished at that statement, and I asked the noble Lord why Her Majesty's Government, in face of that understanding, did not think it necessary to consult Parliament, and the noble Lord replied that the terms were arranged by the late First Commissioner of Works and not by Mr. Akers-Douglas. The fact that Mr. Herbert Gladstone arranged and Mr. Akers-Douglas accepted those terms distinctly negatives his claim that the First Commissioner can deal with all such matters *proprio motu* without consulting Parliament. The claim of the First Commissioner of Works, reduced to its logical conclusion, amounts to this—that the First Commissioner of Works has the right to give a site and erect a statue in any of the Royal palaces, without consulting Parliament, to any obscure or undeserving person which some generous person might be willing to give. Suppose some enthusiastic pro-Boer offered a statue of Mr. Kruger—the First Commissioner of Works, according to this doctrine, is perfectly entitled to give a site, and your Lordships would not be allowed to say a word. Suppose that somebody presented a statue of Guy Fawkes—in the same way Parliament would have no voice in the matter. There is one further point upon which I desire the opinion of the Prime Minister. Assuming that it is no part of the duties of the First Commissioner of Works to consult Parliament in these matters, but that, as a fact, Parliament has expressed an opinion, is the First Commissioner of Works entitled to disregard that opinion, for that is exactly what the First Commissioner has done in this case? On June 17th, 1895, the House of Commons decided, by a majority of 137, that they would not erect a statue to Oliver Cromwell.* This was during Lord Rosebery's Administration. It is true that, technically speaking, the decision of the House was against a reduction of £500, but the tenor of the debate, and, more especially, the tenor of the speech of Mr. Balfour, who led the Opposition, shows conclusively that the House voted against any statue at all to Oliver Cromwell; and I cannot believe that anyone who has read or who heard that debate can seriously attempt to put aside the decision of the House on the plea of so trumpery a technicality. Four days after the 17th of June, Lord Rosebery's Government fell. During those four days the anonymous donor came forward and offered to Lord Rosebery, as head of the Government, a statue which Lord Rosebery, as head of the Government, accepted. He did that in the teeth of the division in the House of Commons against a statue of Cromwell, and it seems to me that this action was a cynical defiance of the wishes of Parliament without parallel, probably, since the days of Cromwell himself. I hope I have not detained your Lordships too long, but I feel strongly on this subject. I believe that the question which I now put to the Prime Minister is one involving a constitutional point of considerable importance. If the noble Marquess holds that the doctrine which the First Commissioner of Works has laid down is correct, that the First Commissioner is legally clothed with this almost papal authority, then, I submit, the sooner his powers are reduced to the level of those of other members of the Government the better for the appearance of the Palace of Westminster and the dignity of our monarchical Constitution.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, my noble friend has led us so deep into the mysteries of constitutional law that I feel considerable misgiving in addressing myself to a matter which really ought to be dealt with by the legal Members of the House. But if I may be allowed to confine myself to answering the question put to me, I will try to do it to the best of my ability. I am asked whether my attention has been called to a speech of the First Commissioner of

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. xxxiv., page 1341.

Works, in which he laid down, as a doctrine of constitutional law, that in the case of the erection of a statue upon which no public money is spent the First Commissioner of Works is under no obligation to consult Parliament as to the acceptance of the gift or the character of the site. Well, my Lords, suppose the converse were laid down, that the First Commissioner of Works must consult Parliament as to every statue which is to be erected throughout the country upon any site over which he has control. I think that is a proposition which will not be found in any of those works on Constitutional law to which I have no doubt my noble friend has referred himself. When I was taught constitutional law, I imagined that the relations of the Executive to Parliament were to be these—not that the Executive had to come to Parliament for leave to act under its executive powers, but that, when the Executive Government had acted in the discharge of its executive powers and had in the view of Parliament committed an error in so doing, the remedy of Parliament was to censure the Minister and to turn him and his colleagues out of office. I believe that to be the sound constitutional doctrine, and I think that the already over-burdened House of Commons would be still more terribly burdened if everything a Minister proposed to do in his executive capacity was subject to debate by Parliament before he exercised his power. I do not think Oliver Cromwell himself would have had any hesitation on this point, and I think even less violent politicians than Cromwell would have protested very strongly against the idea that the powers of the Executive Government are to be exercised by Parliament. Those powers are to be exercised subject to the judgment of and exposed to the review of Parliament. Turning from these grave matters to the smaller details, I will proceed to the next part of the question. I am asked, does this doctrine hold good even when the opinion of Parliament has been expressed against the proposed statue or site? The opinion of Parliament was not expressed against the proposed statue; it was expressed in support of the much more commonplace view, that Parliament declined to vote the money—an attitude which Parliament very frequently takes up, and an attitude which is obviously within its most primary and elementary constitutional powers. My noble friend talks of this as, I think, a piece of trumpery pettifogging. The Vote was refused by a large majority, and therefore my noble friend says Parliament has pledged itself to the doctrine that the statue is not to be erected, even though no public money is required. There, again, I think my noble friend will find it very difficult to summon to the support of that doctrine those lights of learning of which this House is proud. The matter for us is very simple. It is not so much as a matter of constitutional law that the matter appeals to me; what appeals more to my sympathy is the doctrine of continuity of policy. The late First Commissioner of Works undertook to give a site and to accept a statue, and on the faith of that undertaking certain monies were expended by a private individual whose name we shall never know. It seems to me not a matter of constitutional law but of common honesty that when the First Commissioner of Works was changed, his successor should hold himself bound by the promise which his predecessor had given, and should not take advantage of the change, especially when money had been expended by the person to whom the promise was given. It would be impossible to conduct business with the vast number of persons who have to consent to contracts with Her Majesty's Government on matters of very much more importance than this, if the doctrine was once laid down that a change of Government released the incoming Government from all that the former Government had promised. I do not think you can possibly accept such a doctrine as that. I understand that there are three questions at issue. First, ought the money of Parliament to be spent on the matter at all? Secondly, if not, ought Oliver Cromwell to have had a statue at all? And, thirdly, if he ought to have had a statue, ought it to have been placed in the sunken garden to which it has now been banished? I am no adorer of Oliver Cromwell, but if I wished to hand down an unfavourable view of his policy and history I could devise no more outward and visible sign of it than to put him at the bottom of a hole. So long as the anonymous donor, whose political opinions I cannot even guess, is content with that way of honouring the particular hero whom he delights to praise, I do not see that those who belong to what I may call the side of the question to which my noble friend and I belong—to the party which is not supposed to be enthusiastically or extravagantly desirous of honouring Oliver Cromwell—need complain of the arrangement, because I do not see how any arrangement could be devised which would suit our views so satisfactorily. Having a statue, they can hardly have another. No one can lift him out of the depths to which he has been relegated, and I think foreigners will go away from the site, after studying the Statesmen whom we have honoured in the surrounding land, with the observation, "Behold the banishment that a just monarchical Government inflicts upon a rebel and a regicide!"

The Earl of HALSBURY: I would remind the House that the division against the site was taken on the morning of the prorogation, in a very thin House composed of ten Peers, and was only carried by a majority of two. No discourtesy to the noble Lord was intended by me when I pointed out that a division taken in such circumstances was not calculated to add to the dignity of this House or to the respect with which people would regard its decisions.

***Lord MORRIS**: My Lords, I had hoped that some Peer of more importance than I can pretend to be would have intervened in this discussion. The noble Earl who opened it I think satisfied the House that a transaction had taken place that ought not to have taken place. That is the point. I quite agree, if I may take the liberty of saying so, with the noble Marquess that it is not a proper description of the matter to say it is unconstitutional. That is entirely too vague and too large a phrase to describe what occurred; but I do say, and I think everybody who has heard the temperate, concise, and effective statement of the noble Earl will have come to the conclusion, that what occurred ought not to have taken place. I cannot understand how any First Commissioner of Works can find it consistent with his duty to arrogate to himself the right to set up a statue within the precincts of the Palace of Westminster if he knew that the presence of that statue would be objectionable to the great majority of the Members of both Houses of Parliament. If the First Commissioner had such a right why was the statue unveiled in a surreptitious manner on a November night, and why was it accepted from an anonymous donor? I think it is an indignity to both Houses to accept such a statue in such a manner. Is the donor ashamed of his action? Is that the reason he wishes to preserve his anonymity? It is childish to continue to talk of the donor being anonymous when everyone knows in this House and in the street—a favourite place now to appeal to—who the anonymous donor is. He was the Prime Minister of the Crown, and his First Commissioner of Works accepted his statue. What made him so urgent? Was it because Oliver Cromwell disposed in a summary way of the House of Lords, or was it because he was enabled to quote Oliver Cromwell as a great instance to save him from that unpleasant thing, the Nonconformist conscience which objects to racing? The noble Earl—I decline to speak of him as the anonymous donor, for in the Courts of Justice we are in the habit of calling a spade a spade—with reference to the objection of Irish representatives, said that they should not object to a statue in London when Englishmen did not object to statues in Dublin. To this I reply that I would not raise any protest against a statue of Cromwell in the streets of London provided I was not expected to subscribe to it, but it is quite a different matter to erect such a statue within the precincts of the Houses of Parliament, in which Irishmen have an interest in common with representatives of other parts of the kingdom. The point is not that a statue of Oliver Cromwell was to be put up, but that it was put up within the precincts of the Palace of Westminster upon the promise of the First Commissioner of Works, who knew at that very time it was contrary to the wish of both Houses of Parliament. I do not think that point has been met. It is not a question of its being unconstitutional; it is a question of a thing having been done which ought not to have been done, and which was done to a certain extent defiantly. The doctrine of continuity of policy which has been referred to is seldom carried out in things that are right. If Mr. Herbert Gladstone did wrong, why was Mr. Akers-Douglas to persevere in that wrong, particularly when he could shield himself under not only the fact that this House did not approve of it, but that the House of

Commons substantially disapproved of it? Anybody who reads the debate will see that the £500 was a mere bagatelle. The question discussed was, was Oliver Cromwell a person to whom a statue should be erected within the precincts of the House of Commons? Continuity of policy did not justify the First Commissioner of Works in carrying out the mistaken intention of his predecessor to erect a statue to the man who ended, not mended, the House of Lords, and ignominiously drove the Members of the House of Commons from their place of meeting. If the noble Earl who raised this question had concluded with a motion, I think he would have received considerable support in this House. I would certainly have voted for his motion.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I do not think that anyone in this House would desire to go into a discussion as to the merits of Oliver Cromwell; no doubt there are great differances of opinion as to that great historical character. A very considerable time has elapsed since the events in which Cromwell too part occurred, and, for my part, I consider that he was one of the greatest men this country ever produced, and any honour done to him is an honour to the country to which he belonged. Further than that I will not go, nor will I say anything as to the attack made by the opponents of Cromwell. The anonymous donor is a donor whom, undoubtedly, we all know, and that being the case I feel myself justified in saying that I think the anonymous donor, even if he be a member of this House, has done nothing whatever of which he has any reason to be ashamed, but on the contrary I think that everyone who has any respect for the great men of the country ought to be obliged to him for what he has presented to the nation. The only other observation I wish to make is as to the speech of the noble Lord who has just sat down. He seems to have entirely forgotten that there is a bust of Oliver Cromwell at this moment placed on a very conspicuous site within the very walls and precincts of the House of Commons, and that it was placed there since the present Government came into office. If it became a question for discussion, which is the more offensive to the opponents of Oliver Cromwell—the statue in what the noble Marquess called a "hole" outside, or the bust in a central position where it must come under the notice of every Member of the House of Commons? Upon the whole, I think that discussions of this kind about one of our greatest men do no honour to the House, and will not meet with the approbation of right thinking men in the country.

*THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: I am very grateful to the Prime Minister for the full way in which he has dealt with my question. I disagree with the noble Marquess when he says that the statue is in a hole. Though he is technically correct, it must be borne in mind that it is on a pedestal which makes it one of the most conspicuous statues in London. As to the bust in the House of Commons, to which Lord Kimberley referred, it is a question of degree. The bust inside the House is small and not conspicuous. The statue outside is conspicuously before the public; everyone can see it and everyone who sees it knows that it was placed there by a Conservative Government and will infer that it was placed there to do honour to the memory of one who no doubt was a great man. I regret, after the very strong feeling which I observe exists in your Lordships' House on this question, that I did not move a motion instead of asking a question.

G.P.O.—TRANSFER TO MOUNT PLEASANT—POSTAL REARRANGEMENTS, DELAYS, ETC.

EARL STANHOPE: My Lords, I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will explain under what circumstances and in what cases the hours of posting for the provincial mails have been curtailed, in consequence of the transfer of a portion of the work of the General Post Office to Mount Pleasant. It will be within your Lordships' knowledge that certain complaints have arisen owing to the curtailment of the hours to which I have referred. This alteration is a source of great inconvenience in the West End and in the City, and it is with the object of getting an explanation from the noble Marquess the Postmaster General that I have put down this question.

*THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, the question which has been put to me by my noble friend is, if I may venture to say so, a very pertinent and practical one, and I do not in the least regret that it has been asked. The matter is creating certain doubts — I might almost say misapprehensions — in the minds of the public at large, but if it had been possible the Post Office would gladly have avoided the transfer referred to. But they had no other course open to them owing to the pressure of business and the likelihood of that pressure being increased. The Post Office building at St. Martin's-le-Grand, which had hitherto been devoted to sorting purposes, was found to be absolutely inadequate for the work, and as regards the employees there was danger that the sanitary arrangements would be insufficient. To give an idea of the increase in the work during the last few years, I may state that from a return taken in November, 1895, the number of articles posted in the E.C. district weekly was 8,300,000 and the number delivered in the E.C. district was 4,221,000, making a total of 12,500,000. From the latest return of November, 1899, the numbers had risen to 9,536,000 (an increase of nearly 15 per cent.) and 4,761,000 (an increase of nearly 13 per cent.) respectively, or a total of 14,290,000. The number of articles despatched from St. Martin's-le-Grand to places abroad was in May, 1896, 2,033,000. The number is now 2,842,000 (an increase of nearly 40 per cent.), but this is temporarily swollen by the large amount of correspondence which is now sent weekly to the troops in South Africa. Owing also to the reduction of rates of the inland letter postage in 1897 the bulk of the articles sent through the post has materially increased, and this is a serious factor as regards the space available in the sorting office. I think I have shown your Lordships by these figures that some movement was necessary, and it was absolutely impossible to continue the whole of the work in the old building. Consequently my predecessor decided to transfer, roughly speaking, one-half of the duties of St. Martin's-le-Grand to what is now known as Mount Pleasant, a building one mile off on the site of what was formerly the Coldbath Fields prison. For some years a large portion of the business of the parcel post has been carried on there, and on Monday last it was opened for its new work. I do not deny that there has been a certain amount of inconvenience to the public in connection with the transfer, and I do not attempt to shirk any responsibility, but I can only ask your Lordships, and through you the public, to exercise the leniency which is called for when there is a transfer of such a large number of employés and plant. The site of the new building is on the extreme edge of the E.C. district, but it was the only site available for a building of the dimensions necessary, and, as your Lordships know, it belonged to the Government. The duties transferred to Mount Pleasant were those relating to the postal arrangements connected with the provinces. The foreign mails and all the postal arrangements connected with London will remain at St. Martin's-le-Grand. I wish particularly to impress upon your Lordships that practically there is no alteration in the hours of posting in any district in London as a result of the change, except in the E.C. district. There may be certain delay in connection with letters posted in London in the middle or early part of the day. Letters posted in the south or east of London and intended for the south and east provinces will have further to go to Mount Pleasant than they had to the old Post Office. But there will be a corresponding gain in point of time with regard to letters posted in the north and west for the north and west provinces, for the reason that those districts are nearer to Mount Pleasant. Except as regards the E.C. district there will be no alteration in the hours of posting for the night mails to the provinces. At Mount Pleasant the hours of posting will be the same now as they have hitherto been at St. Martin's-le-Grand, and the hours of posting for the general night mails will be maintained all over the district. But letters intended for despatch to the provinces by mails other than the general night mails should as a rule, if posted elsewhere than at Mount Pleasant, be posted about half an hour earlier. I may mention that in the E.C. district letters will no longer be able to be posted in pillar and wall boxes with an extra halfpenny stamp up to seven p.m. It has been found that of the 50,000 letters per night so posted an average of only 700 bear the extra stamp, and it is not practicable to examine 50,000 letters for the sake of 700. It has therefore been decided to abolish the wall and pillar boxes for late-fee letters. I wish it to be understood that although that facility is taken away the facilities offered are satisfactory, because at every post-office in the east-central district the facilities for late-fee posting will exist as before, and no one will have to walk more than 200 yards in the east central district in order to reach a post-office. The main point to which exception has been taken is that late-post letters must be posted at St. Martin's-le-Grand at 7.30 instead of at 7.45, as hitherto. The pressure at the General Post Office has been so great that it has been found absolutely necessary to remove a certain portion of the work to another building. It takes a quarter of an hour to get from St. Martin's-le-Grand to the new building, and that quarter of an hour has to be made up in some way, otherwise the mails would not catch the trains. After considering the matter very carefully my predecessor arrived at the conclusion, in which I concur, that that quarter of an hour should be taken off the time allowed at St. Martin's-le-Grand. I believe the inconvenience has been greatly exaggerated. I can only say, on behalf of myself and the Department over which I preside, that we do not think we are asking too much of the public, having regard to the convenience of every part of the country, and that we believe we shall be able to carry on our enormous and daily increasing task in a manner which will give satisfaction to the country.

HOURS OF LABOUR IN SHOPS.

LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, I rise to ask the Prime Minister whether he would consent to the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the long hours of labour in shops. In a recent debate on the Early Closing Bill the noble Marquess, while admitting the length of hours of labour in shops, objected to the Bill, on the ground, mainly, or at any rate among other reasons, that though it was drawn in accordance with a unanimous resolution of the House of Commons, and had passed through two Committees of that House, it did not, in his judgment, sufficiently protect the interests of the consumer. The loss of the Bill has caused great disappointment to the shopkeeping community, and I beg to ask the noble Marquess whether he will consent to the appointment of a Committee to consider the subject.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I do not think that this matter is at all an unfit one for the consideration of this House, but I should demur to the appointment of a Committee so late in the session, when it would hardly be possible to obtain the attendance of Peers who would be adequately fitted for examining into a question of such complexity. The great novelty of the proposal made by the noble Lord imposes upon us the duty of examining very carefully what the effect will be of limiting the hours of labour in shops, and how far the interest of various classes of the community would be injuriously touched by it. In some recent debates we have had the doctrine laid down, which, I confess, very much alarmed me, that whenever a Commission or Committee which was appointed by the Government was unanimous on a subject, the Government was thereupon bound to accept the conclusions to which they had arrived. I entirely demur to any such suggestion. I have no belief in the infallibility of Commissions or Committees, though they may be of great assistance to Parliament in the investigations of social phenomena which it is their duty to make. I will not pledge myself as to the course we shall pursue with respect to the recommendations which may be made, but I entirely concur with the noble Lord that this is a suitable matter for Parliament to investigate. It is a matter of extreme difficulty, and I hope that some care will be taken to appoint an impartial Committee.

LORD AVEBURY: I am very much obliged to the noble Marquess for consenting to the appointment of a Select Committee. I quite concur that it should not be a partisan Committee, and I am sure the advocates of early closing would be desirous that it should be a Committee which would inspire the confidence of your Lordships' House. I beg to give notice that I will move for the appointment of a Committee at the commencement of next session.

COLONIAL MARRIAGES (DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

House adjourned at Twenty-five minutes past Six of the clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 21st June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Order [22nd March], That the Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill be committed to the Committee to be nominated by the Committee of Selection for the consideration of other Private Bills relating to electric power, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the order be discharged."—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) remarked that he quite understood the reasons for removing this Bill from the Special Committee mentioned, but thought that it was important it should be referred to a Committee of no inferior status.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith) replied that the Bill was not affected in any way by the questions which the Special Committee had been appointed to consider in connection with the Electric Lighting Bills. The only question involved in it was one relating to fisheries, and he really could not understand how it came to be put in the group of Electric Lighting Bills. The Special Committee which had been sitting since the beginning of May had still a heavy Bill to deal with, and under the circumstances he hoped that the House would accept this resolution and allow this particular Bill to go to another Committee.

Question put, and agreed to.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL [ANNUITIES] (BY ORDER).

Resolution reported:—"That it is expedient to authorise the creation of Annuities to be charged on and payable out of the Revenues of India in lieu of the sum of money amounting to £34,859,217 17s. 6d. agreed upon for the purchase by the Secretary of State in Council of India of the undertaking of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, and the payment of any costs and expenses incurred by the said Secretary of State under any Act of the present session for vesting the said undertaking in the said Secretary of State in Council of India; and also any costs, charges, and expenses of obtaining and passing the said Act not provided by the surplus profits arising from the said undertaking for the half-year ending the 30th day of June, 1900."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

*MR. JOHN ELLIS said that he yesterday took the somewhat unusual course of objecting to this stage being passed. In view of the fact that it was merely a Report from the House in Committee, he would not enter into the matter at length; but he would like again to emphasise his opinion that this matter should have been dealt with in a public instead of a private Bill, and he proposed to raise that point when the Bill itself came before the House.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he understood it would not be competent for anyone at this stage to raise the point alluded to by his hon. friend, but he would like to recall to the memory of the noble Lord a strong Report signed by himself on a similar occasion, protesting against dealing with matters of this character in private Bills. He would further like to ask what the noble Lord anticipated would be the future history of the Bill. Would it go to the Unopposed Private Bill Committee, or would it be sent to a Select Committee? He held that in a matter of this magnitude the House should be afforded an opportunity, through a Select Committee, of examining the provisions of a Bill which imposed a charge of 35 millions on the Indian revenues, and he believed that if the noble Lord would only suggest that the Bill be sent to a Select Committee that would at once be done.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I think there is still some misunderstanding with regard to the Bill.

As a matter of fact, it was not necessary to apply to Parliament in order to acquire possession of this railway. Contracts were made and sanctioned by Acts of Parliament passed many years ago, which enabled the East India Company to enter into negotiations with certain railway companies, for guaranteeing the interest on their capital and for an option of purchase. I was informed by my legal advisers that that option of purchase could be exercised, and that all the arrangements could be made so far as the purchase is concerned. But the stock of this railway is largely held by trustees, and I am told that unless some special arrangement is made in connection with annuities it may be very difficult for trustees to hold their stock hereafter. The transaction is quite simple and above board, and I am ready to agree to any procedure that may be desired, provided it will not delay the conclusion of ths business. But I am bound by the form and practice of the House. It is a private Bill, and I understand that it will go to the Chairman of Ways and Means. I assume that it is not opposed, and that it will in the ordinary course come back to this House without going to a Committee.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill, that they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution. —(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

BLACKPOOL, ST. ANNE'S, AND LYTHAM TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

COWES PIER BILL [Lords].

Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

GREAT CENTRAL RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

MOTHERWELL WATER BILL [Lords.]

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL AND CLONTARF URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL (JOINT COMMITTEE).

Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH reported from the Joint Committee on the Dublin Corporation Bill and the Clontarf Urban District Council Bill, That the parties promoting the Dublin Corporation Bill had stated that the evidence of Frederick C. Pilkington, D.L., J.P., of Westbury, Stillorgan, county Dublin, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Frederick C. Pilkington do attend the said Committee on Monday next, 25th June, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Frederick C. Pilkington do attend the Joint Committee on the Dublin Corporation Bill and the Clontarf Urban District Council Bill on Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

WEST HAM CORPORATION BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section B), with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Central London Railway Bill, without Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Stockpor Corporation Tramways Bill, Wakefield Corporation Market Bill, Ossett Corporation Gas Bill, Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Lancashire Inebriates Acts Board Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Abergele Gas, Irthlingborough Gas, Littlehampton Gas, Lymington Gas, Mablethorpe and Sutton Gas, and Romford Gas." Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 263.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (PROHIBITION OF CHILD LABOUR UNDERGROUND) BILL.

Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COUNCILLORS (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kilmarnock, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Cullen, Fraserburgh, Banff, and Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Petitions against, from Shoreditch, and Enfield; to lie upon the Table.

INEBRIATES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dunfermline, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) ACT (1854) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Kilmarnock; and Dundee; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSED PREMISES (HOURS OF SALE) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petition from Erith, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY BILL.

Petition from Birmingham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

PETTY CUSTOMS ABOLITION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Linlithgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Dunfermline, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF WOODLANDS.

Petition from West Ham, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Romford; Swindon; Walsingham; Ploughfield; Sandbach; Norwich; Morpeth; Kempston; Bampton; Caerphilly; Boston; Houghton - le - Spring; Broadwindsor; Stourbridge; Brighton; Wolverhampton; Ruckhall; Dorstone; Shenmore; Cagebrook; and Powchurch; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against, from Torquay; and Darlington; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Watchet; Tettenhall Wood; Winchester (five); Ossett; Stockport; Rochester; King's Lynn; Clungunford; Croydon; Swindon (two); Hebden Bridge; Porthleven; Llorney; Lewisham; Withnell Fold; Caerphilly; Salford (two); South Hiendley; Royston; Shivemoor; Portishead; Hersham; Jarrow; Sutton; Bedford (two); Andover; Macclesfield; Bampton; Pontypridd; Chelmsford; Nailsea; Exmouth; Morley; Ampthill; Kempston; Maulden; Biggleswade; Shillington; Bratton Fleming; Morley; Land Key; Langridgeford; Leicester; Wigston Magna; Loddiswell; Tiverton; Llandrindod Wells; Llangunllo; Mirfield; Bradford (three); Pontnewynydd; Penybont;

Bideford; Abbotsham; Longridge; Walsall; Newchurch; Morpeth (two); Cranborne; Langton; Heckington Fen; Sleaford; Cornsay (three); South Moor; Dulwich; Walsall; Penge; Hull (eight); Blackburn; Edinburgh; Walsingham; Aspatria; Maryport; Folkestone (three); Norwich; Bristol; Mansfield Woodhouse; Upper Parkstone; Walton (three); Atherstone; Longford; Hampstead Road; Warrington; Ore; Tolmer Square; Stoneferry; Aldeburgh; Clayton le Moors; Rishton; Little Hulton; Moseley Road; Ferndale; Hythe; Littlehampton; Bridgwater; Bedwellty (two); Brixham; Jarrow; Rugeley; Sutton-in-Ashfield; Houghton-le-Spring; Worthing; Dulverton; Ringley; Greenhithe; Dartford; Monmouth; Collingham; Llanbadarn Lower; Radcliffe; Sheerness; Pontywain; Little Lever; Maidstone (five); Pontypridd; Thorne Branch; Kimpton; Bristol (eleven); East Kirkby (two); Weston-super-Mare; Minehead; Belvedere; Mansfield (four); Pleaseley; Pleaseley Hill (two); Liverpool; Isle of Wight; Atherstone; Hull (four); Small Heath; Guilden Morden; Nuncargate; Norwich; Platt Bridge; Lamberhead Green; Bacup (three); Winfarthing; Ince; Fersfield; Hindley; Abram; Fareham; East Bridgford; Liverpool; Ashley Down; Moses Gate; Little Hulton; Upton; Rawtenstall (two); Levenshulme; Rastrick; Blairgowrie; St. Pancras; Brighouse; Truro; Chapel Ashton; Audlem; Chester; Clotton; Whitegate; Bedminster; Wellington; Swanwick; Belper; St. Kilda; Jarrow-on-Tyne (five); Farnworth; Nuneaton; Radcliffe-on-Trent; Blackwood; Stow; Freshwater (three); Aughton; Great Lever; Sheffield (fifteen); Bingham; Newcastle-under-Lyne (two); Llwynadda; Aberystwith; Bath; Nunney; Westfield; Fulham; Totterdown (six); Ryndwyclydach; Llansamlet Higher (two); Llansamlet Lower; Gowerton; Llanguicke; St. Albans (two); Willington; Cheltenham; Waterfoot; Stroud; Threeburrows; North West Ham; Murton Colliery; Liscard; Branksome; Marylebone (two); Clapham Junction; Newent; Kingswood (three); Stratford; Market Harboro'; Baddesley; Atherstone (three); Bistre; Buckley; Woodborough; Old Basford (four); Bulwell; Ryhope (two); Petworth; Marshland; Faringdon; East Hagbourne; Irby; Rossendale; Mount Tabor; New Feary; New Brighton; Heswall; Great Saughall; Birkenhead; Seacombe; Liscard; Egremont (two); Reading (three); Aylsham; Notting (three); Appledore; Oldbury; Darwen; Ilfracombe; Barnstaple; Prenton; Eastham; Beeston; Arnold; Daybrooke; Rushcliffe; Finchley Road; Ipswich; St. Thomas; Exeter (two); Hatfield; Bristol (four); Repton; Mickleover; Littleover; Middlesborough Langtoft; Bridlington; Ashby-de-la-Zouch; Plymouth; Buckfastleigh (four); Bawell; Markham; Bury; Bulmer; St. Leonards (two); Cefncoedycymer; Merthyr Tydfil (twelve); St. Helens; Holywell Green; Burslem; Hampstead; Okehampton; Wilby; Single Hill; Streatham; Llandoxery; Burry Port; Llandilo; Slingsby; Coneystorpe; Silverhill; Amotherby; Kirkheaton; Women's Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Society; Bolton (two); Caerphilly; Treforest (two); Abercynon; Pontypridd (three); Rhydfelen; Enfield; Llanwonno; Darwen; Westburn; Hampstead; Bressingham; Gateley; Little Ryburgh; Appleby; Troutbeck Bridge; Kentish Town (three); North Lopham; Weston-super-Mare; Bath; Hemington (two); Frome; Wellow; Single Hill; Tiverton-on-Avon; Radstock; North Petherton; Tryddyn (two); Ffynnongroew; Ystradyfodwg (two); Williams Town; Llwynypia; Birkenhead; New Brompton (two); Bolton; Rawmarsh; Rotherham; Gwyrsyllst; Fulham (two); London; Sleaford; Mexborough; Okeford Fitzpane; Luton; Romford; Hull (two); Honley; Houghton-le-Spring; Tewkesbury Abbey; Rumbold; Hastings; Sturminster Newton; Boston; Brixham; Wolverhampton; Sharpness; Pembroke Dock; Leeds; Child's Hill; Southampton; New Brompton (two); Camberwell; Dunstable; Herne Hill; Widnes (four); Sleaford; Huddersfield; Nottingham (nine); Hale Bank; St. Day (two); Hayle; Goonbell; Camborne (two); Willesden (three); Piddletrenthide; Llanedy; Harlesden; Portesham (two); Abbotsbury (two); Whitby; Ilford; Sawbridgeworth; Rotherham; East Ham; Blandford; Sherborne; Great Stanmore; Stalbridge; Marnhull; Harlesden; Hendon; Winterborne Kingston; Sturminster Newton; Okeford Fitzpaine; Ibberton; Birmingham (three); Dodworth; Romford (three); Broadwindsor; Skipton; Yetminster; Derby (two); Ambleside; Peterborough; Brighton (five); Kirkby

Lonsdale; Casterton; Hove; Toddington (two); Kendal; Leighton Buzzard; Kilbirnie; Cricklewood; Worcester; Little Ilford; Hull; Harold Wood; Crane Moor; Ruabon; York (five); Birdwell; Worsboro' Bridge; Worsboro' Common; Silkstone Common; Sharpenhoe; Thurgoland; Cullen; Whitby (two); Hornchurch; Finchley Lane; Luton; Wychbold; Birdwell; New Barnet (seven); Burtle; Bridgwater (three); Minehead; Stourbridge; Barlborough; Aspley Guise; Calverley; Stratton St. Margarets; Dronfield; Beighton; Lydiard Tregooze; Sheffield (two); Preston; Staveley; Shaw; Dewsbury; Leek (four); Bradley Green; Lancaster and Cheshire Working People; Camden Road; Manchester; Cheetham Hill; Heath Town; Wolverhampton (two); Nottingham (five); Cotgrave; Hockley two); Cheadle; Devonport; Stonehouse; (two); Stoke; Boston (seven); Sutterton; Leek; Butterwick; Aspley Guise (two); Wadebridge; Leeds; Luton; Barton; Toddington; Romford (sixteen); Newquay; Cheetham Hill Road; Chester (four); Palin Street; Barnton; Norley; Shurlack; Rathy; Mevagissey; Kingstone; Vowchurch; Ploughfield; Didley; Ruckhall; Dorstone; Shenmore; Coventry (two); Walsall; Chasetown; Burntwood; Stockport (two); Morley; Newbattle; New Invention; Knighton; Wakefield; New Lambton; Upper Parkstone; Poole; Wareham; Carlisle; Southsea; Cagebrook; East Dulwich; Troedyraur; Great Grimsby (two); Pudsey; Egremont; Cheshire; Sulcoates; Clay Cross; Great Driffield; Wimborne; Filey (two); and Kingswood; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Kirkcaldy; and Kilsyth; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Bothwell; Lesmahagow; Kircaldy; Dysart; Carsphairn; Swinton; Kingarth; Peebles; Elgin (two); Callendar; Dunnichan; Dundee (five); Glasgow; Kelvinside; Lochee; Dalziel; and Govan; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL, AND SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Bath; and Maidstone; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (NO. 2) BILL; SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL; AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Worcester, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Rotherham; Rawmarsh; Llwynypia; Gwersyllt; Drighlington; Sleaford; Okeford Fitzpaine (two); Luton (four); Ibberton; Hull; Upton Park; Tewkesbury Abbey; Sturminster Newton (two); Honley; Hastings; Rumbold; Boston (two); Evesham; Sharness; New Brompton; Dunstable; Poole; Sleaford (two) Widnes (three); Nottingham: St. Day (two); Hayle; Goonbell; Childs Hill, N.W.; Willesden (two); Llanedy; Portesham (two); East Ham; Birmingham (two); Teddington (three); St. Pauls; Broadwindsor; Kildwick; Abbotsbury (two); Kendal; Brighton (two); Hove; Kinning Park; Brentwood; Southampton; York (three); Cricklewood; Wadebridge; Mount Charles; St. Austell (two); Charlestown; Wolverhampton (five); Hook; Stratton St. Margarets; Manchester (five); Shaw; Purton; Buckland Newton; Piddletrenthide; Whitby (five); Blandford; Sherborne; Stalbridge; Marnhull; Winterbourne; Derby; Tebay; Ambleside; Peterborough; Casterton; Kirkby Lonsdale; Romford; Ruabon; Little Ilford; Burtle; Puriton; Minehead; Stourbridge; Bridgwater; Barlborough; Sheffield (three); Staveley; Dewsbury; Aspley Guise; Biddulph; Bradley Green; Cheadle; Stoke; Sharpenhoe; Packmoor; Oldbury; Darwen; Sutterton; Boston; Butterwick; Swineshead Bridge; Polgooth; Newquay; St. Blazey; Fowey; Carlisle; Edinburgh; Croydon; Ibstock; Withnell Fold; Swindon; Tiverton; Porthleven; Llanquicke; Knighton; Lloiney; Nailsea; Fenton; Sutton; Pontnewynydd; Talymain; Arlesey; Portishead; Chelmsford; Bedford (two); Loddiswell; Biggleswade; Shillington; Maulden; Langridgeford; Barnstaple; Kempston; Leicester; Wigston Magna; Llandegley; Ampthill; Wakefield; Tettenhall Wood; Newchurch; Morpeth; Langton Maltravers; Poole; Wareham; Cranborne; Heckington Fen; Hulme; Eastwood; Great Driffield; Blackburn; Bradford (three); Norwich; Shaldon; Ratby; Chesterton;

Maryport; Southwark; Filey; Aldeburgh; Walton; Chester (three); Radford; Nottingham; Shurlach; Barnton; Stanningley; Pudsey; Bewdley; Calverley; Nelson (three); Bradley; Roughlee; Clayton-le-Moors; Southfield Barley; Reedyford; Egremont; Sandbach; New Invention; Chasetown; Burntwood; New Lambton; Morley; Stockport; Hylton; Teignmouth; Garndiffaith; Bath; Mevagissey; Kingstone; and Didley; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Llwynypia; Llanedy; Bridgend; Troedyrawr; Llandegley; and Caerphilly; to lie upon the Table.

TEINDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dunfermline, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TEMPERANCE REFORM THREEFOLD OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Longringgend, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VIVISECTION.

Petition from Hull, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY IN THE PROVINCES (CONTRIBUTIONS IN LIEU OF LOCAL RATES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 23rd February; *Sir Albert Rollit*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 221.]

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY (COUNTY OF LONDON).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 23rd February; *Sir Albert Rollit*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 222.]

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Account presented, of the Receipts and Payments under the Act during the year ended the 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 223.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION (TRAINING COLLEGES).

Copy presented, of Reports relating to Training Colleges for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL WORKS.

Copy presented, of Statement showing the total estimated cost of each work, the estimated expenditure thereon to 31st March, 1900, and the amount available to meet expenditure in 1900-1901, together with the expected date of completion [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION.

Copy presented, of Statement of the estimated Income and Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation for the year 1900-1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 224.]

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Copy presented, of Two Orders, Nos. 6,092 and 6,106, dated respectively the 16th May and 16th June, 1900, revoking certain Orders of the Board relating to the Landing of Foreign Animals [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1900-1901).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 28th May; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 225.]

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 527 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

LOCAL TAXATION (ENGLAND) ACCOUNT 1899-1900.

Return ordered, "showing, in respect of the financial year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, the distribution of the proceeds of the Local Taxation, Licences, Estate Duty, and Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Duties paid into the Local Taxation (England) Account in pursuance of the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1888, the Finance Act, 1894, and the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 301, of Session 1899)."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — LORD ROBERTS'S PROCLAMATION ANNEXING THE ORANGE FREE STATE.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can say what has been the effect of Lord Roberts's proclamation of annexation of the Orange Free State on the status of the inhabitants; and whether any such inhabitants found fighting with arms in their possession will be treated as prisoners of war or as rebels.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The effect of Lord Roberts's proclamation of annexation was that the inhabitants of the Orange Free State became British subjects. Lord Roberts had undertaken by his proclamations to the burghers of the Orange Free State that those desisting from hostility and found staying in their homes and quietly pursuing their ordinary occupations would not be made to suffer in their persons or property on account of their having taken up arms in obedience to the order of their Government. The treatment of all other persons, may, I think, be safely left to Lord Roberts.

MARTIAL LAW—TREATMENT OF CAPE REBELS.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Minutes of the late Ministry of Cape Colony as to the treatment of rebels in Cape Colony.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think it would be desirable that these Papers should be laid upon the Table at present, but I am communicating with the present Cape Government on the subject.

MEDICAL TREATMENT OF SOLDIERS ON FURLOUGH—CASE OF PRIVATE MITCHELL.

SIR EDWARD GOURLEY (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of Private Mitchell, of the Wiltshire Regiment, who was shot in both ankles at the battle of Modder River, and is now an inmate of the Lambeth workhouse; and will he state why Mitchell was turned out of Woolwich Hospital and compelled to seek shelter at a friend's house in Lambeth; and will he inform the House what arrangements have been made by the War Office for the reception, housing, and maintenance of private soldiers invalided home from South Africa, whether in consequence of being wounded or from other causes; and whether any definite system of pensions has yet been fixed by the War Office for the widows of officers and men losing their lives during the South African campaign.

MR. MARKS (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg at the same time to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of Private Mitchell, of the Wiltshire Regiment, who was wounded in both legs at the battle of Modder River, and was recently discharged from Woolwich Hospital because the hospital authorities wanted room, and subsequently admitted into the Lambeth workhouse infirmary in a weak state of health; whether the case has been reported to the War Office by the Lambeth guardians; and what action, if any, the War Office intends to take in the case.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There are over 7,000 beds reserved in the various military hospitals for private soldiers invalided from South

Africa. On reaching convalescence the soldier is transferred to a convalescent home. We have ample accommodation for the first stage of recovery in hospitals and for the second in homes. But many soldiers prefer to proceed on sick furlough to their friends. This is allowed when their health justifies it. They are, in that case, provided with sufficient funds and with a printed statement for their guidance which contains this paragraph—

> "Soldiers on furlough who require medical aid shall apply for it to the nearest military station. When this is impracticable they may apply to a civil practitioner, to whom they will show this furlough paper, and who will be allowed to charge for attendance at the rate laid down on Army Form O, 1667."

Arrangements had been made to send Private Mitchell to a convalescent home, but, at his own request, he was allowed to go on furlough to Croydon. On leaving hospital he received £7 17s. 6d. pay. Private Mitchell states that the people with whom he intended to stay had left Croydon. He accordingly proceeded to London, and, feeling ill, went to the Morley Hotel, 112, Lambeth Road. His health did not improve, and, when he had spent two days and two nights in bed, the manager sent for a doctor, who ordered his removal to the infirmary. A gentleman at the hotel applied to the commanding officer, St. George's Barracks, for his removal to a military hospital. The reply did not arrive before his removal. He was accordingly visited in the infirmary and removed in a military ambulance to the Station Hospital in Rochester Row. I beg to thank the hon. Members who, by raising this question, have given me an opportunity of stating the facts at a length which will not, I hope, be considered excessive in view of its importance. There has been much comment on this case, and I shall be obliged if the press will give equal publicity to the fact that civilians who find a soldier left stranded on their hands should apply to the nearest military authority, and not despatch him incontinently to a pauper institution.

2ND BATTALION WILTSHIRE VOLUNTEERS—CASE OF JOHN KING.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can inform the House of the reasons which led on the 25th of May to the reduction of Sergeant John King, of the 2nd battalion of the Wiltshire Regiment of Volunteers, to the ranks, and his discharge on the same day from the force on account of his reduction to the ranks, and if he can inform the House by whose authority he was dismissed; if there is any appeal to the War Office from the above dismissal; and if he is aware that Sergeant John King has been a member of his corps for twenty-five years and a non-commissioned officer for twenty years, and that he has on several occasions shot for England in rifle competitions and holds Her Majesty's decoration for long service and good conduct.

The following question on the same subject also appeared on the Paper:—

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): To ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to the recent reduction to the ranks and eventual dismissal of Sergeant John King from the Devizes detachment of the 2nd Wilts Rifle Volunteers in consequence of a speech made by him at the South Wroxall Liberal Club, in which he adversely criticised the policy of the Government in South Africa; whether he is aware that Sergeant King was a member of the English twenty at Bisley and an alderman of the Wilts County Council; and, whether the Secretary of State for War will consider the revision of the sentence.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Sergeant King, whose service is correctly stated in the question, was reduced to the ranks for inefficiency, and was consequently discharged by the commanding officer of the battalion, both proceedings being in accordance with the Regulations and the Volunteer Act, which give such officer full powers both to reduce and discharge a Volunteer, subject only to the Queen's pleasure. The case has been carefully considered, and the Secretary of State sees no reason for interfering with the lawful award of the commanding officer.

VOLUNTEER CAMPS OF INSTRUCTION—OFFICERS' COMMAND PAY.

MR. LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of officers commanding regimental districts, under Army Order 119 of this year, who when in command of Volunteer brigades at camps of instruction have their command pay as officers commanding such districts deducted from their field allowance, or acting staff pay, of one guinea, granted in accordance with such Order during the time they are in camp with their Volunteer brigades, and whether he can see his way to bring about the alteration of such Order so as at least to avoid such deduction.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Command pay is given for one duty and acting staff pay for another. The same officer cannot receive both rates of pay, because he does not perform both duties. The command pay is given to the officer who takes command of the district during the colonel's absence.

PROMOTIONS FROM THE RANKS.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether commanding officers of units serving in South Africa have been asked to recommend for commissions two non-commissioned officers from each battalion who shall be not over twenty-five years of age and unmarried; and whether, seeing that these conditions may debar non-commissioned officers otherwise meritorious, including some who have commanded companies in action and have been mentioned in despatches for distinguished service, they may not be made subject to exceptions, and commissions be granted in special cases at least with a view to departmental employment.

*MR. WYNDHAM: We know nothing of any such instructions. Lord Roberts was asked to recommend for commissions a few non-commissioned officers who had performed good and meritorious service as apart from distinguished service in the field; these were to be under thirty years of age and unmarried. No restrictions are imposed on recommendations for distinguished service in the field.

BRIGADE SIGNALLING OFFICERS' PAY.

MR. HUDSON (Hertfordshire, Hitchin): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, as the Divisional Signalling Officers in South Africa are drawing extra or Staff Captain's pay, he will also increase the pay of the Brigade Signalling Officers on the Staff of the Brigade, especially those who have been engaged in Natal, where, owing to the nature of the country, signalling has been of such importance, any other method of communication having been impossible.

*MR. WYNDHAM: It has not been hitherto considered necessary to appoint more than one staff officer for signalling in each division. It is possible that the experience of the war may lead to a modification of this rule; we shall await the reports of the generals in the field.

IMPERIAL PENNY POSTAGE—EXTENSION TO ORANGE RIVER COLONY AND THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has extended the Imperial penny postage system to the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal, South Africa.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The question of extending penny postage to the Orange River Colony was taken up by the Postmaster General immediately on the announcement of the annexation, and is now under consideration by Her Majesty's Government. The question as to the South African Republic is scarcely yet ripe for discussion.

DECEASED OFFICERS' WAR MEDALS.

GENERAL RUSSELL (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether, seeing that it is the custom to send to relatives of officers who have died on service in the field the medals to which these officers have become entitled by that service, he will explain why the Sudan Queen's medal has been refused to an officer who lost his life in the 1896 campaign on the Nile.

*MR. WYNDHAM: My hon. and gallant friend probably refers to the case of Captain Fenwick, of the Royal Sussex

Regiment, who died in the Dongola Expedition of 1896. For that expedition no Queen's medal was granted.

SALISBURY PLAIN MANŒUVRES—COMMISSARIAT BREAKDOWN.

Mr. HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the breakdown of the commissariat of the Manchester Volunteers on the occasion of their recent encampment on Salisbury Plain, whereby the men were practically without bread for two days, receiving in substitution hard biscuits which required a hammer to break them; and whether, in consequence of the general dissatisfaction of the men with their food arrangements, supplies were subsequently obtained from their friends at home; and, if so, whether he can give the name of the officer responsible for this state of things, and undertake that steps shall be taken in future to avoid its recurrence.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: Three of the four battalions of the Manchester Volunteer Brigade at Salisbury Plain did not employ the Government bread contractors, but made their own arrangements. The private contractors partly failed to carry out the supply, and 640lb. of the biscuit ordinarily issued to the troops was supplied from the Government stores to make up the deficiency. Nothing is known of any supply from friends at home, some 250 miles distant.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Does the hon. Gentleman wish the House to understand that the regiments which had to get their food through the War Office made no complaint? That certainly is not the case.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: I did not mean the House to understand that. It is not in my power to give any such information. The deficiency arose out of private contracts entered into by Volunteer brigades this year as hitherto, and not through any default on the part of the authorities.

Lord BALCARRES: Is it not the fact that the quartermasters of many of the regiments were directed by the War Office as to whom they were to apply to for food, and that they were really not given a free hand?

*Mr. WYNDHAM: Another question raises that issue. In respect to bread and meat the Volunteers were allowed to exercise the discretion they enjoyed before, but in respect of canteen stores that was not always the case.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether it has been brought to his notice that some of the Volunteer battalions encamped on Salisbury Plain are not permitted to make their own contracts and arrangements with reference to canteens, as in former years, and that some are even compelled to deal exclusively with the Canteen and Mess Co-operative Society, Limited; and whether he will take steps to give to Volunteer battalions the same freedom of choice in connection with this matter as heretofore.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: For military reasons it was considered expedient to form a district contract for all units encamping on Salisbury Plain. The board to select the tenders was composed of one Regular, four Militia and four Volunteer officers; and two contractors, viz., Messrs. Dickeson and Sons and the Canteen and Mess Co-operative Society, were selected.

POST OFFICE VOLUNTEERS—CAMP LEAVE.

Colonel DALBIAC (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the same privileges can be extended to the assistant postmen as to the other classes of Post Office employees in regard to leave, to enable them to attend Volunteer camps during the present year.

Mr. HANBURY: The privilege of leave on full pay to attend Volunteer camps is confined to those officers whose whole time is at the disposal of the Department, and the Postmaster General, I am informed, sees no reason for extending it to assistant postmen and others who give only a portion of their time and are not required to do a full day's work.

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT CASUALTIES.

Mr. CHANNING: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state what action will be taken, by court-martial, by reprimand, or otherwise, to determine the responsibility for the Aldershot casualties, and to impose upon those found responsible any appropriate penalties; and whether the contractors, if any, who failed to supply the troops with food will be struck off the lists in future, or otherwise dealt with in respect of their breach of contract.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: As I have already explained to the House in the debate on Army Estimates of the 19th inst.,† the steps taken by the Commander-in-Chief are deemed sufficient. The civilians employed had no contract with the Government. The question of their continued employment rests with the officer commanding the corps concerned, who will no doubt take proper notice of what occurred.

Sir J. FERGUSSON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the men sent to hospital at Aldershot on account of illness caused by the heat on the 11th inst. are subjected to hospital stoppages, and whether the allotments to the families of such as are married will therefore cease; and whether any pensions will be payable to the widows, if any, of those who died on that day.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: The regulations admit of the full remission of the stoppage in such cases, the discretion rests entirely with the general officer in command. The separation allowance to the families will not cease. The question of pension will be referred to the Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund, who have control of the funds available for this purpose.

GENERAL STAFF AT ALDERSHOT.

Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can now state when the General commanding the troops at Aldershot was appointed, and whether this general officer, who entered the Army in the year 1850, has been able to transact any business or be present at any field days lately at Aldershot; and if he will give the number of troops now stationed at Aldershot.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: This officer was appointed on the 15th December, 1899, to command the Aldershot district. On the 22nd May he proceeded on sick leave, but he expects shortly to return to Aldershot. The number of troops stationed there is 29,400.

Mr. JEFFREYS: Is the same staff which had been considered sufficient for a division of 15,000 men now considered sufficient for 29,000?

*Mr. WYNDHAM: That question hardly arises out of my answer. We have a sufficient staff. As my hon. friend knows, a great number of our general officers are in South Africa.

VOLUNTEER CAMPS—MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Mr. BILLSON (Halifax): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if the Army Order relating to the payment of Volunteers in camp will limit the payment to medical officers to one such officer for each corps, so that when a corps is entitled to two or more medical officers all but one will have to pay their own expenses; and, if so, why medical officers should be placed in such a position.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: The Order allows pay for one medical officer in each unit, one additional for each brigade, and three for each bearer company. This is considered sufficient.

MACHYNLLETH RIFLE RANGE.

Colonel PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he is aware that work on the Machynlleth Rifle Range was suspended on 12th May last when near completion, although the range is urgently required; and if he can say when sanction will be given for the range to be completed.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: Sanction has been given for the completion of the range.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, looking to the use that is being made of Indian troops for Imperial purposes in South Africa and China, and looking also to the distressed condition of India, the Government will take into early consideration the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure as to the apportionment of charge between India and the Imperial Exchequer.

---

† See debate commencing at page 480 of this volume.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I agree with the hon. Baronet that no time should be lost in coming to a decision on the recommendations of this Commission. I am already in communication with the Departments concerned, and I hope shortly to be able to conclude the whole matter.

INDIAN FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state at what date the explanatory memorandum of the Indian Financial Statement will be issued to Members; and will the total figures be expressed in tens of rupees, so as to allow of comparison with previous statements.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The explanatory memorandum is in the press, and will be issued to members as early as possible. The total figures will be expressed in pounds, so as to allow of a comparison of the figures in the Estimates with those in the accounts. The figures in the return of net income and expenditure from 1888–9 to the present time, which has just been presented, have been re-cast, and shown in pounds, in order to facilitate a comparison of the accounts during that period.

AFGHANISTAN—PROHIBITION OF TRADE WITH INDIA.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Ameer of Cabul has forbidden the export of horses to and the import of salt from India; and whether the Government of India has any means of checking such action on the part of a Prince who receives a subsidy from the Indian Treasury.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The Government of India has received reports from its agents which seem to confirm the action imputed to the Ameer in the hon. Member's question. As regards the second question, the hon. Member is aware that the Ameer is a sovereign who is independent in the conduct of his internal administration.

INDIAN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

MR. MACLEAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can say what is now the total strength of the British and native troops withdrawn from the Indian establishment for service elsewhere, including the troops under orders for China; and whether the Government of India is taking any steps to supply the places of these troops.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The total strength of the British and native troops withdrawn from the Indian establishment for service elsewhere, including the troops under orders for China, is approximately 16,000. We hope that the British troops now serving in South Africa will shortly return to India, but so far no steps have been taken to replace the native troops serving abroad.

INDIAN BUDGET.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, looking to the Viceroy's statement that the famine in India exceeds in intensity any previously recorded visitation, he will arrange for the Indian Budget to be brought forward at an early date.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Indian Budget, I suppose, will be taken at the ordinary time.

MR. MACLEAN: Is there any special reason why the Indian Budget should be delayed until the last days of the session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, there is no special reason.

TURKISH GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS —ENGLISH TENDERERS.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the tenders of an English firm for the repair and re armament of the Turkish fleet are below those of the German firm of Krupp and Co.; whether the contract is likely to be given to the German firm in consequence of political pressure; and whether Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople will be instructed to give support to the desire of the Turkish Government to decide this question on its financial and technical merits.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Her Majesty's Government have no information to confirm the statement in the first paragraph. They are informed that a contract has been signed for the repair of eight Turkish ironclads by a firm at Genoa. It is stated that the armament is to be supplied by Messrs. Krupp. Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has already brought the claim of a British firm to the notice of the Sultan, and His Excellency has since been authorised to express the hope that British firms may receive a fair share in the orders for war material given by the Turkish Government.

RAILWAYS IN ASIA MINOR—RUSSIAN CONCESSIONS.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether an Imperial Iradé has been issued by the Sultan giving to Russian subjects the sole right of constructing railways in a large portion of Asia Minor fronting the Black Sea; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government have made any protest against this monopoly and new sphere of interest, the practical effect of which will be to prevent the industrial development of Asia Minor.

*MR. BRODRICK: Her Majesty's Government understand that an arrangement sanctioned by Imperial Iradé has been arrived at between Turkey and Russia by which the Turkish Government reserve to themselves the right to construct railways in the North of Asia Minor, and in case they do not make the railways themselves they undertake to grant the exclusive right of construction to Russian subjects on the same terms as the concession of the Anatolian Railways to the Germans. Her Majesty's Government have no official cognisance of this arrangement, and no protest has been made against it.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Will the Government protest when they get the official information?

[No answer was returned.]

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN DISTURBANCES—RECENT OPERATIONS—TIENTSIN AND PEKING.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received any further information relating to the safety of British subjects in Peking and the progress of the relieving force.

*MR. BRODRICK: I regret to say we have no authentic information. Our last communication from Sir Claude MacDonald is nine days old. The Admiral's force when last heard of seven days ago was between thirty and forty miles north-west of Tientsin and the same distance from Peking. Tientsin, which is thirty miles from Ta-ku, is now cut off from Ta-ku, and telegraphic messages from the latter place have to be conveyed by steamer to Chefu, a distance of about 250 miles. The latest news we have is a despatch from Rear-Admiral Bruce, which is as follows—

"Ta-ku, viâ Chefoo, 21st June.—There has been no communication from the Commander-in-Chief for seven days nor with Tientsin for five days. Allies hold Ta-ku forts and Tong-ku securely, and they will advance for the relief of Tientsin when in sufficient strength. Troops are expected from Hong Kong to-morrow, and 300 from Wei-hai-wei the day after to-morrow. It is believed that fighting is constantly going on round Tientsin. Our garrison there should be about 3,000 men. Following proclamation was agreed to this morning to be issued at once: 'The admirals and senior naval officers of the allied Powers in China desire to make known to all Viceroys and authorities of the coasts and rivers, cities, and provinces of China that they intend to use armed force only against Boxers and people who oppose them on their march to Peking for the rescue of their fellow-countrymen.'"

COMMAND OF THE BRITISH FORCES IN CHINA—CO-OPERATION OF JAPAN WITH THE EUROPEAN POWERS.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury the following question, of which I have given private notice:—Whether Her Majesty's Government propose to appoint a general officer to command Her

Majesty's forces on land in China, and whether the alleged accord between the European Powers as regards the disturbances in China also includes Japan.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Admiral on the station has been given full powers to act in the existing difficulty. It is not possible at present to state what future arrangements will be made. The reply to the second part of my hon. friend's question is in the affirmative.

*SIR. J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): As it has just been announced that military forces are going out to China, is it proposed to place them under the command of the Admiral?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not possible to answer that question at present.

FRENCH CONCESSION AT SHANGHAI.

MR. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether all the correspondence relative to the concession to France at Shanghai has been published.

*MR. BRODRICK: The Papers presented included all the correspondence which was material to the issue, and which could properly be published.

LEAD POISONING—RETURNS.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if a Return can be granted showing the number of cases of lead poisoning in the different branches of china and earthenware manufacture, so as to distinguish between the decorative branches and those concerned with dipping, ware-cleaning, etc., and a Return showing for recent months the number of temporary suspensions of workers in china and earthenware, and the number of permanent suspensions.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): I think it will be possible to grant a Return giving most of the information asked for by the right hon. Baronet in the first part of his question. As regards the distinction between temporary and permanent suspensions, no hard and fast line can be drawn between the cases in which exclusion from the dangerous processes will in the end be permanent, and those in which it will not. But on this point also I hope to be able to give some details. My right hon. friend the Under Secretary of State will give notice of the Return this afternoon.

CLERK OF THE PEACE FOR STAFFORDSHIRE.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the salary of the Clerk of the Peace of the County of Stafford has been increased from £1,500 a year to £2,500 a year, with an allowance of £1,500 a year for clerks, although certain areas of the county have been removed from the county council by the creation of county boroughs, and whether such increased salary and allowance have received the sanction of the Local Government Board.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer that in 1896, under the special circumstances of this case, I sanctioned a salary of £2,000, with £1,500 allowance for office expenses, the amount to be reconsidered on the occasion of a vacancy. Since then no recommendation has been made to me.

MR. COGHILL: Is the holder of the office allowed to continue his private practice?

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I do not remember as to that. I only know that under the special circumstances of this case I sanctioned this office allowance.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION IN THE CHANNEL ISLANDS AND THE ISLE OF MAN.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is now in a position, consequent upon negotiations with the authorities in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands, to introduce a Bill to extend the superannuation of teachers to the teachers in those islands; and, if so, at what date he hopes to introduce the Bill.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I have a draft of a Bill in this direction very nearly settled. It will be, I have every reason to believe, a non-controversial Bill, and I will consult my right hon. friend the Leader of the House with a view to seeing when it can be introduced.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.

MR. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if, under Clause 11 of the First Schedule of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, a workman is entitled to submit himself for examination by the qualified medical practitioner appointed for the district in which he resides by the Secretary of State, when the medical practitioner appointed by his employer has given a certificate upon his condition with which he is not satisfied, although the case has not been before a committee, arbitrator or judge, in consequence of the employer and the workman having previously agreed to pay and receive a fixed weekly sum as compensation.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: The provisions of paragraph 11 of the First Schedule to the Workmen's Compensation Act apply to any workman "receiving weekly payments under the Act." Whether any particular case of agreement is "under the Act" is a question which can only be decided authoritatively on the facts of the case by a court of law, and I am unable to express an opinion on it in general terms.

SCOTTISH TRAINING COLLEGES.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the attention of the Education Department has been called to the inadequacy of the number of students in the training colleges (especially in the western division) to meet the increasing demand for teachers owing to the growth of the number of children attending schools, and the reduction of the size of classes enjoined by the Code; and whether the Department will consider the necessity of taking measures to increase the number of adequately trained teachers.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): In reply to the question of the hon. Member, I have to state that the Department has, from time to time, received representations to the effect that the supply of trained teachers is not sufficient. The relation between supply and demand is at all times a difficult one, influenced as it must be by various circumstances. It must be remembered that the training colleges are not the only source from which the supply of trained teachers may be recruited; but the Department is prepared to consider any proposals for maintaining the adequacy of that supply.

MR. CROMBIE: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the attention of the Education Department has been called to the dissatisfaction felt by Queen's Scholarship candidates who duly qualify but are refused admission to the training colleges in order to give place to candidates entering without examination under Article 70 (d) 6, and 95 (a) 2; and whether the Department will either give a preference to Queen's Scholar candidates or impose some further competitive test on the other classes of candidates referred to.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Candidates for admission to training colleges may qualify either by the Queen's Scholarship examination or by the Leaving Certificate examination. The question as to which examination produces the most promising class of student is one which can be settled only by experience, and the Department is not prepared to interfere with the discretion of the training college authorities in this respect, or to impose any further competitive test upon either class.

SLOUGH RAILWAY ACCIDENT.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received any official information regarding the railway accident which took place at Slough Station on Saturday last; whether the information tends to show that the accident resulted from an unusually large number of trains being put upon the lines for the convenience of visitors to the Windsor races; and whether he will give instructions for this point being thoroughly sifted in the course of the Board of Trade inquiry into the causes of the accident.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): Yes, Sir; the Board of Trade received an official report of the accident, and an inspecting officer is engaged in holding an inquiry. I understand from that officer that it is unlikely that the number of trains had anything to do with the accident, but he will no doubt bear the hon. Member's point in mind during the investigation.

LIVERPOOL CENSUS RETURNS.

SIR JOHN WILLOX (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the last report of the medical officer of health for the city of Liverpool, in which allegations are made of the inaccuracy and unreliability of the census returns of the last census, and the consequent errors in the calculation of the mortality averages for the decennial period; and, whether measures will be adopted to ensure greater correctness in taking the next census by the employment of more competent enumerators or otherwise.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): The question of my hon. friend appears to be founded on a misapprehension. No allegations are made in the report referred to of the inaccuracy and unreliability of the Census returns. The medical officer appeared to have been referring to the estimates of population in the years between 1881 and 1891. These estimates were based on the increase in population in the ten years between 1871 and 1881, and the result of the last Census showed that in the case of Liverpool the rate of increase had not been maintained. There appears, however, to be no reason to suppose that the Census returns themselves were inaccurate.

G.P.O.—TRANSFER TO MOUNT PLEASANT—POSTAL RE-ARRANGEMENTS, DELAYS, ETC.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state who is responsible for the delay caused to the merchants and business men of great towns and cities in this country, notably Sheffield and Newcastle, through the misdirection and delay in forwarding numbers of London letters, and will he consult some leading men of business in commercial circles before he deprives the public of posting facilities hitherto enjoyed.

MR. MADDISON (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that many letters posted in London before 6 p.m. on Monday, 18th June, were not delivered in Sheffield on the following day, and will he explain the delay, and whether the causes of it were foreseen at the Post Office, and why no intimation of possible delay was given to the public beforehand.

MR. HANBURY: As the hon. Member is no doubt aware, owing to the want of space at St. Martin's-le-Grand, the provincial despatching work formerly done there has had to be transferred to a new office in the Farringdon Road, part of the site of the Coldbath Fields Prison. The transfer of a force of 2,500 men to new surroundings was naturally attended with some temporary disadvantage to the work, and on this account the correspondence could not be dealt with altogether as expeditiously as under normal conditions. The Postmaster General regrets that any inconvenience should have been caused to the public in carrying out this change, and he begs to assure the hon. Member that every effort is being used to restore the regular working of the service at the earliest possible time.

MR. MADDISON: Can you answer the latter part of my question?

MR. HANBURY: I cannot answer that.

BRITISH MUSEUM—ANNUAL RETURN.

SIR HENRY HOWORTH (Salford, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can expedite the printing of the Annual Return of the British Museum, which was laid upon the Table of the House early in the session, and has not yet been delivered to Members.

MR. HANBURY: The Annual Return for 1899, finally revised for press by the authorities of the British Museum, was sent to the Treasury on 12th June, and forwarded to the printers on 14th June. The Report will be delivered on Monday next, the 25th.

IRISH GOLD ORNAMENTS—TREASURE TROVE.

MR. J. MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, having regard to the announcement to the Trustees of the British Museum by the Government of their intention to take proceedings with a view to a judicial decision on the title of the Museum to the recently acquired Irish gold ornaments, whether he will lay upon the Table the correspondence on the subject between the Treasury and the Trustees of the Museum, as well as the Report of the Departmental Committee presided over by Lord Rathmore.

MR. HANBURY (for Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): The correspondence is voluminous, and contains moreover the Law Officers' opinions, which it would be contrary to established practice to lay before Parliament. I propose, however, to present a summary in some detail of what has passed between the Treasury and the Trustees, but before doing so I shall submit such summary to the Trustees in order to ascertain whether it is in their judgment a fair representation of the case. The report of the Departmental Committee was presented to Parliament last year.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry): Will the right hon. Gentleman add to the Return a copy of any regulations or minutes issued by the Treasury in respect of treasure trove since the passing of the Act of 1837, and also a note of legal proceedings, if any, which have since been instituted for the recovery of treasure trove.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must see the documents before I can promise to lay them on the Table. Perhaps my hon. friend will put his question on the Paper.

KILLYLEA NATIONAL SCHOOL.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why the teaching staff of the Killylea National School, county Armagh, which has been connected with the Board of National Education in Ireland for a period of seventeen years ending March 31st, 1900, have only received results fees for sixteen years; and whether any arrangement is being made to pay the one year's fees yet due.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Results fees, as such, are not payable after the 1st of April, 1900; but teachers who taught under the results system up to the end of last financial year will receive an equivalent for such fees, based on the average payments for the last three years. The mode of payment is at present under consideration.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman say what will be the course of business next week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The first business on Monday will be the Report stage of the Australian Commonwealth Bill, and this will be followed by the Housing of the Working Classes Bill in Committee. I am not so sanguine as to suppose that we shall finish the latter Bill on Monday, and if we do not the proceedings on it will be continued on Tuesday. The Companies Bill will be introduced on Tuesday if the Housing of the Working Classes Bill is finished.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): And when will the Irish Tithe Rent-Charge Bill be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On Thursday.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): When will you take the Second Reading of the Factories and Workshops Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I have given all the information in my power about business.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRADE, ETC.

Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., have leave to sit this day till Four o'clock during the Sitting of the House.—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 226.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 226.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 258.]

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND).

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The object of the Bill I have to introduce is to amend certain details in the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, in respect of which difficulties of working have cropped up. No useful purpose would be served by my going into those details, but I hope and believe the Bill will be found to be non-contentious.

Bill to amend Sections 42, 51, 54, 56, 57, 69, 103, 115, and 121 of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and Articles 19, 24, and 36 of the Schedule to The Local Government (Application of Enactments) Order, 1898, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend Sections 42, 51, 54, 56, 57, 69, 103, 115, and 121 of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and Articles 19, 24, and 36 of the Schedule to The Local Government (Application of Enactments) Order, 1898," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 259.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IRELAND (No. 2).

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: At the present time the procedure of Councils in Ireland cannot be altered except by Act of Parliament. We think it desirable to introduce an easier process and to provide for greater elasticity, and this Bill consequently proposes to enable it to be done by Provisional Order instead of by Act of Parliament.

Bill to provide for the alteration of the Local Government (Procedure of Councils) Order, 1899, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

"To provide for the alteration of the Local Government (Procedure of Councils) Order, 1899," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 260.]

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND).

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: This, my third Bill, is intended to enable guardians or unions in Ireland to send children to schools or institutions not situated in those unions, and also to enable them in certain cases to exceed the limit of land now allowed to be set apart for the erection of labourers' cottages.

Bill to amend the Poor Relief (Ireland) Acts, 1838 to 1892, with respect to relief given by the maintenance of lunatics and children, and with respect to the quantity of land which may be acquired under those Acts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend the Poor Relief (Ireland) Acts, 1838 to 1892, with respect to relief given by the maintenance of lunatics and children, and with respect to the quantity of land which may be acquired under those Acts," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 261.]

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 5 :—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, to leave out from the word 'Notwithstanding,' to the word 'State,' in line 18, both inclusive."—(*Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.) : I have to ask the permission of the House to make a correction of a statement which I made on Monday last in dealing with this Amendment. I then said, or I am reported to have said, that I had received no official communication from the Government of the four States of Australia in reference to the proceedings which had taken place since the introduction of this Bill, and that, up to the present, I was not officially made aware of the opinions of the Governments of the four States. I find that that was a mistake. It would have been more correct to say that I had no public official statement, but I have been reminded by my hon. friend Mr. Barton of a matter which escaped my memory at the time—namely, that after the first arrangement was come to with the delegates I received on 25th May from the Government of New South Wales a telegram, which I thought then was confidential but which I am now told was not intended to be confidential, to the effect that the Prime Ministers of the four States of Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania, and South Australia agreed to the arrangement which had been come to between the delegates and myself. I desire to state this, because the previous statement might have led to a misunderstanding and to the supposition that the delegates were acting without the authority of their Governments. Of course, I did not in the least intend to convey that; but I admit that my words were open to that construction, and I have to apologise to the Committee and to the delegates for the slip. It has, however, no particular relevance to the present Amendment. When we adjourned on the last occasion I had informed the Committee that I had communicated with the Governments of the different colonies in order to ascertain, if possible, what their views were with regard to the new arrangement which had been come to. At that time I had no complete account of their opinions. I have since received telegrams which I think I had better read to the Committee. The first is from Lord Beauchamp, New South Wales, received 20th June :—

"The Premier informs me that Victoria, Tasmania, and Queensland agree to the compromise in connection with Clause 74. New South Wales Parliament, now sitting, has expressed wish that altered clause should be submitted to it."

The next is a telegram from Lord Tennyson, South Australia, dated 20th June—

"Ministers reply as follows to your telegram 19th June :—They do not think that any difficulty will be caused if Imperial Parliament resolves to amend Bill as now proposed."

Lord Gormanston sent a telegram on 19th June as follows—

"Your telegram of 16th June received. My Government are quite satisfied with the clause set forth therein as the best under all the circumstances of the case."

With regard to Queensland, I have received a letter from Mr. Dickson, dated 19th June, in which he says—

"Sir,—Referring to my letter of the 15th inst. and to our later interview of Saturday afternoon, I now beg to inform you that I have since received from my Government the following cablegram :—'Full text of new Clause 74 sent through Tennyson to Australian Governors received. Consider it great improvement on previous Amendment, and request you will not offer any objection to it.' Consequently I will now accept on behalf of the Government of Queensland the new Clause 74 as presented to the House of Commons yesterday, and trust it may be passed unaltered. I desire, however, to record on behalf of my Government and of myself that we should have greatly preferred to have had the Bill as introduced by you passed without Amendment. May I suggest that further consideration be directed to the bearing of the words 'final and conclusive' in Clause 73, page 16, lines 27–28, in connection with new Clause 74? I cannot conclude without expressing to you my gratitude for the clear, straightforward manner in which you placed my attitude before Parliament in your speech of yesterday evening, and tendering you, on behalf of the Government of Queensland, our fullest appreciation of the great patience, care, and courtesy with which you have endeavoured successfully to reconcile views at first sight irreconcilable; trusting also that these long negotiations may now be considered as satisfactorily concluded."

Lastly, I received from the officer concerned in administering the government of Victoria a telegram dated the 21st of June, as follows—

> "Ministers entirely approve clause now offered, and I am desired by them to convey their cordial thanks to you for your great trouble and kindly interest in our Australian matters, and to express our congratulations to you on having arrived at a successful settlement."

Now I think I may say that I have very great satisfaction in once more pressing for the Amendment which has been laid before the Committee. I do not myself regret in the least the time that has been spent in what I have heard described in some quarters as "muddling negotiations," but which have resulted in bringing absolutely into line the colony of Queensland, which was in favour of plenary appeal, and the colony of South Australia as representing the extreme views with regard to the restriction of the right of appeal. So far as four out of five of the federated States are concerned, the proposed arrangement has been accepted by all the delegates, thoroughly and cordially accepted. So far as New South Wales is concerned, we have still to wait for an expression of opinion on behalf of that colony; but in any case four out of five of the colonies have expressed their opinion, and, if I may venture to advise the Committee on the subject, I should say that, looking at the reports we have received from non-official sources, there can be very little doubt that they are equally acceptable to the vast majority of the people of New South Wales. They are equally acceptable to Her Majesty's Government. By this arrangement we have obtained everything for which we thought it our duty to contend, speaking on behalf of Imperial interests that are non-Australian. I have to repeat, after the most careful consideration, that we have secured in connection with the Australian federation precisely the same powers and rights of appeal which exist in the case of the great Dominion of Canada, with this trifling exception, which I am almost inclined to think is an improvement, that in certain rare cases the leave to appeal will be granted by the High Court in Australia, and not by the Privy Council. I have said that I think that that may possibly be an improvement, for this reason—that where the leave to appeal is to be given by the Privy Council it involves two applications to that body, which necessitates two sets of costs. The appellant has first to ask for leave; and, leave having been given, the merits of the case have to be tried. In this case leave will be settled by the local Court without the necessity of appealing. This Court, I imagine, will be considerably less expensive, and only the merits of the case will be tried by the Privy Council. I do not think I need refer to anything else except to say this—that my hon. and learned friend the Member for Haddingtonshire took me by surprise, in fact he astounded me, when he endeavoured to put forward the argument that either of these arrangements which we have recommended to the Committee as distinct from the original proposals of the Bill was really more restrictive of the right of appeal than the original Bill. I do not intend to argue with my hon. and learned friend, but what I have to say perfectly clearly is that the whole of Australia differs from him. Queensland—which, as I have said, was in favour of the plenary right of appeal—and the other colonies are in favour of a restricted right of appeal, but all of them have accepted the arrangement with the understanding that it very much enlarges the right of appeal which was conceded by the original Bill, and apparently they are now satisfied to accept the arrangement proposed by Her Majesty's Government as being in the interest of Australia as well as in the interests of this country.

*MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): I wish to make one or two observations in reference to what has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman. It is quite true, as he said, that the Australian colonies have accepted this arrangement, but our contention was not in relation to anything which the Australian colonies were fighting for; our contention was that that should be preserved which the Australian colonies had already conceded. Our point was made in the interests of the Queen's dominions outside Australia, including those of New Zealand. The right hon. Gentleman was no doubt correct when he said that he had satisfied the Australian colonies with this clause. He has done so; but these colonies have been willing to concede something more than the right hon. Gentleman has got—namely, that where the interests of someone else outside themselves were in question the validity of those interests should be subject to appeal to the Privy Council. The right hon. Gentleman has said he has obtained everything which the Canadian Constitution gives with a trifling exception. What is that trifling exception? It is that there can be no appeal whatever to the Privy Council, except with the leave of the new High Court of Australia. Something like that question arose when the Canadian Constitution was under consideration, and the Canadian Supreme Court showed a tendency to take the view that it was the proper court to dispose of all questions of constitutional controversy, and that the Privy Council was not the place to appeal to. The Supreme Court of Canada conceived that its decisions should lay down the law finally as to questions arising between the Dominion and the provinces. What would have been the position of the provinces to-day if it had been left to the Supreme Court of Canada to say whether or not there should be an appeal? Does anyone imagine they would ever have got leave to appeal? I take it the Supreme Court, taking the view that it was properly the final court of appeal, would have refused leave. We do not want to run that risk here. The right hon. Gentleman talks of having settled with the Australian colonies, but there are other places to be dealt with besides the Australian colonies; New Zealand, for instance, which has large interests in this matter. The following letter, dated 19th June, 1900, deals with this matter. It was addressed to the Under Secretary for the Colonies by the Agent General of New Zealand.

> "Sir,—I have the honour to further address you on the subject of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act.
>
> "I have not had the opportunity of perusing any authenticated copy of the Amendment of Clause 74 which it is now proposed to insert in the Bill. Assuming, however, that the version published in *The Times* newspaper of this morning is correct, it appears to me that under it the position of outside States which may become involved in litigation with the Commonwealth or one of its provinces is open to doubt. I have read with attention the speech of the Attorney General, Sir Robert Finlay, but there seems to be at least a difference of opinion as to whether the right of appeal to the Privy Council may not be taken away in cases which involve at once the constitutional position of the Commonwealth in regard to its provinces and also the interests of some outside community. It is the earnest desire and request of the New Zealand Government that the present rights which our colony and colonists enjoy of appealing to the Privy Council may not be taken away, diminished, or left in any doubt whatever.
>
> "I have, therefore, the honour to ask that her Majesty's Government may be pleased—if the point before referred to seems, on reflection, to admit of doubt—to insert in the clause such language as may put the matter beyond the possibility of controversy.
>
> "My Government confidently believes that it is not the intention of the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies to allow the existing rights of any of Her Majesty's subjects outside the proposed Commonwealth to be impaired or abridged.
>
> "The Australians themselves have never set up any claim to do this, and the request of the New Zealand Government would, therefore, seem to be in accordance with the manifest wishes of all parties.
>
> "I am, etc.,
>
> "W. P. REEVES."

That seems to represent the exact position, and reference to the Bill will show that in many respects the interests of New Zealand are likely to be vitally affected in the matter of trade, commerce, fisheries, etc. What objection can there possibly be to introducing this safeguard? Why not add words to the end of Clause 74—words which will restore the position of things before the unfortunate Amendment was made? To make the position of New Zealand clear I propose, when we come to Clause 74, to move to add words to provide that with respect to any question affecting the public interest of any part of the Queen's dominions outside the Commonwealth, the Privy Council may give leave to appeal. That seems to me to be most important, because New Zealand will not have any representative in the first instance at all in the High Court, certainly not before federation, and it would undoubtedly prevent the friction which did arise in the case of Canada. I can see no possible reason why the right hon. Gentleman should not, at any rate, consider these words, thereby giving that reasonable satisfaction to the people of New Zealand to which they are entitled.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether Western Australia has been considered?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir, I have communicated with Western Australia. It must be borne in mind that in the first instance we can only recognise directly the federating States. The opinion of others interested is important, but we cannot guide our decision by those outside the Commonwealth. I have received the following communication from the officer administrating the government of Western Australia (received June 20th)—

> "Ministers of opinion last proposal as to appeal of Privy Coucil preferable to proposal to allow Executive Government decide question. But Ministers strongly of opinion appeal from High Court should be by right and not by permission. Ministers think Federal Parliament should not have power to limit matters of appeal anu that it should be made quite clear that existing right of appeal to Privy Council is maintained."

That is to say, Western Australia, like Queensland, and perhaps others who have not been communicated with in this matter, is in favour of my original proposal; but the arrangement which we have come to, and by which all are brought into line, is accepted.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I am sure both sides of the House will receive with a great deal of satisfaction the announcement made by the right hon. Gentleman that this prolonged quarrel has been now brought to a close, and that we may pass the Bill with the assurance that it will be satisfactory to the people of Australia. The right hon. Gentleman says that the delegates are satisfied with his latest arrangement, and he also says that it is perfectly satisfactory to Her Majesty's Government. I am rather surprised about that latter statement, because it seems to me that the right of appeal with the restrictions imposed by the present Act will become quite illusory. The appeals to this country have been very few, and not on matters of public interest to Australia. They will become fewer and more rare in the future, and in the natural course of things they will disappear altogether. There are very few cases at all likely to come to this country which are of interest to the public of Australia. It is said that certain questions affecting foreign affairs may be brought up and referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council — appeals, for instance, in regard to New Caledonia and the islands possessed by Germany—but questions of that kind would never come into court. They would be brought to the notice of the Executive Government of the day. For instance, we have heard of cases with regard to the French shore of Newfoundland. No one would suggest that a question of that sort should be referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It is always a matter for negotiations between the French and British Governments. I think that this right of appeal will very soon, under the Act, fall into disuse, and I am perfectly convinced that that is the best thing which can happen to it.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): I have very great diffidence in rising to attempt to controvert the arguments of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Haddingtonshire. I think, however, that the hon. and learned Gentleman has not sufficiently distinguished between the character of the constitution proposed in this Bill and the Canadian constitution. In the latter the Dominion and Provincial Legislatures have mutually exclusive powers of legislation. Here each State in the Commonwealth will have the fullest powers of legislation, affected only by the Colonial Laws Validity Act and the power of reservation and the ultimate power of disallowance. The Commonwealth will have limited powers of legislation, and therefore there can be no question of difficulty as to the limits *inter se* of the constitutional powers of the Commonwealth and the States.

MR. HALDANE: Will the hon. Gentleman permit me? He has over looked Clause 109, which states that when the law of the State is inconsistent with the law of the Commonwealth, the latter should prevail.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I have not overlooked that clause. As long as the Commonwealth Parliament does not exceed its powers its legislation would countervail any legislation of a State; if it exceeds those powers the question becomes an Imperial one. I venture to think that difficulties are not likely to arise in matters of legislation, but rather in matters of executive action, and it is in that direction we have to look mainly, if not entirely, for the questions which may come to be decided, as between the Commonwealth and the States, by the High Court. If that is so I venture to think the hon. and learned Gentleman's fears are unfounded, and that the compromise, or the arrangement, or whatever else it may be, may be accepted by this House without any fear of trenching on Imperial interests or the interests of the colonies.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I express no opinion on the controversy between my hon. and learned friend and the hon. Gentleman opposite. I rise for the purpose of saying that we are in a much more favourable position for dealing with this question now than we were on Monday last. In the interval the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies has had an opportunity of ascertaining the views of the colonies concerned, and even if this clause were open to more criticism than is the case, I think the general opinion of the Committee now is that having received the assent and approval of the colonies concerned, it ought to be carried into effect.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I desire to say a very few words in explanation of the effect of this clause, by way of removing the apprehensions expressed by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Haddingtonshire. I cannot but feel that these apprehensions are based on some failure to appreciate the true effect of the clause as it now stands. The first thing I wish to make perfectly clear to all concerned is this—that it will rest with the Privy Council to determine whether or not a particular matter falls within the restriction of this particular clause. The High Court will have no power to settle whether a particular matter falls within the restriction. On application to the Queen in Council the Judicial Committee would look into the whole matter, and if they were of opinion that it did not fall within the restriction, leave to appeal would be given whatever the opinion of the High Court might be. I cannot help thinking that the apprehensions expressed by the hon. and learned Gentleman with reference to New Zealand are based on some misapprehension as to the essential differences between the Australian Bill and the British North America Act. It is perfectly true that Article 51 of this Constitution confers many powers on the Parliament of the Commonwealth which are almost identical in terms with those enumerated in Section 91 of the British North America Act. But in addition to the powers there enumerated there are certain most important powers not now enjoyed at all by any of the Australian colonies, such as powers with reference to foreign affairs, to fisheries beyond the territorial limits, and other matters of that kind. These powers are newly conferred on the Commonwealth, and with regard to them it will not be a question as between the Commonwealth and the States as to their distribution, because the States will possess, at all events, the most important of these new powers, including those in respect to which controversy is likely to arise. It will be a question not of distribution, but as to whether certain powers in respect to these matters have or have not been delegated to the Parliament and Government of the Commonwealth. So that there is absolutely no restriction by this clause as to an appeal to the Privy Council as to whether or not these powers have been so delegated. As the Bill came from Australia it might exclude absolutely any appeal whatever to Her Majesty in Council in these matters. The peculiar condition contained in the clause as it came from Australia—namely, if "the public interest in any other part of Her Majesty's dominions" was concerned—is now set at rest by the settlement arrived at, and the right of appeal to Her Majesty in Council is introduced as regards these new powers not hitherto enjoyed by any of the colonies. Now we come to another aspect of the case to which the hon. and learned Gentleman referred—that is, where a State has enjoyed certain powers, and where powers in respect of these matters have been conferred by this Bill upon the Parliament and the Government of the Commonwealth. Now, what I would direct the attention of my hon. and learned friend to is this: the scheme of this Bill is essentially different from the Canadian Bill. The Canadian Bill conferred, in respect of certain matters, exclusive powers upon the Parliament of the Dominion; in respect of certain other matters, exclusive powers upon the Legislatures of the Provinces; so that the form of the question which arose was this—whether or not the one or the other Parliament would be acting *ultra vires* if it meddled with a matter exclusively assigned to the other. That is not the scheme of this Bill at all.

What has been done is this: on the Parliament of the Commonwealth are conferred, in respect of a number of matters, concurrent powers with those which have been enjoyed, and will still be enjoyed, by the Parliaments and the Governments of the States. The States in respect of these matters will still retain their powers, and the only question which can arise is as to whether any Act of the State Legislature will be *ultra vires*. In regard to Article 51 no controversy can arise as to any power having been taken away from the State Legislatures, because the States will retain all the powers they have enjoyed. The question that will arise is a totally different question. In the immense majority of cases it would not be whether the Commonwealth Parliament or the State Parliament had power to legislate on the matter, because both undoubtedly had. The scheme of the Bill is different. The question that would arise is this:—Under the 109th article of the Constitution, if the law of the Commonwealth and the laws of the State were in conflict, the law of the Commonwealth prevailed. The question would not be as to the relative powers of the Commonwealth and the States *inter se*, for in a question of the construction of the Commonwealth statute with the State statute, if they bore on the same subject, the Commonwealth law prevails. That is not a question which will be affected by the terms of the arrangement now arrived at. An appeal on the question of the construction of a statute will be absolutely free as at present. That is to say, if Her Majesty in Council thought fit to grant leave of appeal there would be no conflict. My hon. and learned friend referred to a very interesting case affecting a Chinaman, and he asked whether the State Legislature had not acted *ultra vires* in legislating on that subject. In Australia that question cannot arise, because no jurisdiction is conferred on the Commonwealth Parliament to legislate with regard to aliens, yet the State Legislature would retain all its powers, because the powers are concurrent. In regard to the other case mentioned by my hon. and learned friend as to rivers and lakes, the great rivers and lakes of America concern another Power than the Dominion of Canada; but no such question could, of course, arise in Australia, and therefore it could not lead to complication. I would point out, moreover, that the Amendment as proposed does not bear on an appeal in any class of cases whatever. As the Bill came from Australia, in certain classes of cases resting on the interpretation of some doubtful and obscure words there was no authority or power to give leave to appeal from the High Court to the Privy Council. There could be no appeal from the High Court to the Privy Council on any constitutional question unless it related to the public interests of some other part of Her Majesty's dominions. Now the effect of that was that in an excepted class of cases they set up two Courts with co-ordinate jurisdiction, and as to that particular class of case the High Court and the Privy Council are co-ordinate with no possibility of appeal from the one to the other. It might have been argued on the Bill as it came from Australia that the High Court in these cases would not have been bound by the decision of the Privy Council. No such contention can possibly be raised under the clause as it is now settled, because there is the power of appeal to Her Majesty in Council in every case. The only difference is that while in the immense majority of cases leave to appeal is to be granted as heretofore by application to Her Majesty in Council, such special leave in one small class of cases—which affect Australian interests almost exclusively — is to be granted from the High Court, and the Privy Council is recognised as the Appellate Court. It has been asked, if this leave is to be got from the High Court, on what principles will the High Court act in granting or refusing the application? I confess that I have some confidence in the action of the High Court. It has been the glory of our race all over the world, that the Judges in every part of the United Kingdom and in every British Colony have acted absolutely independently of political considerations. As these Judges have acted in the past I believe they will act in the future, and I think it will be found that there is no ground for any distrust or apprehension as to the way in which the High Court will exercise the powers with which it is entrusted in this very small and special class of cases as to whether there shall be an appeal to the Privy Council if the interests of any other part of Her Majesty's dominions are affected. It is very difficult indeed to see how a question of the distribution of powers between two

Australian States could affect the interests of another part of Her Majesty's dominions. But if by any human possibility such a case should arise, that is a special reason for allowing an appeal, and it is much better to have a provision in this elastic form instead of trying to find a form which will stand for all time without any power on the part of any Court to vary it. I would suggest to the Committee, and all those interested in the matter, that it may be left in the shape which it has now assumed—a shape that has given satisfaction alike to all those in Australia who approved of a limited appeal, and those who asked for an unrestricted appeal.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I entirely assent to the argument addressed to the House by my right hon. and learned friend that in cases which arise as to the powers of the Commonwealth Parliament and those of the State Parliaments, the decision should be left to the Privy Council; in other words, it would be for the Privy Council to say whether the matter ought to come before it or not by way of appeal. In regard to the difference between the Canadian and this Constitution, that is not material; but I think my hon. and learned friend goes rather too far if he suggests that it is absolutely impossible that a Constitutional question involving the public interests of some other part of Her Majesty's dominions can arise, where the question is, *primâ facie*, one between the Constitution of a State and the Constitutional powers of the Commonwealth.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I did not say absolutely impossible. I think it is extremely improbable, and that it would be dealt with by the power which the High Court has to allow appeal on cause shown.

MR. BRYCE: I do not suggest that it is a probable case, but my hon. and learned friend the Member for Haddington was quite right in pointing out that this is a case that might arise, and that if it did it would have been better to have retained the words "public interests," which the original draft of the Australian Constitution contained, and which set of words had been used by the Privy Council itself in a famous decision. Probably it was from that decision that the words "public interests" in the original draft were drawn.

Sir Robert Finlay.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The words are "public interests in some other parts of Her Majesty's dominions."

MR. BRYCE: It is said that these are vague words. They are wide words, and the Privy Council would have given them a very wide interpretation. After all, there is not very much difference between us, and I pass on to enter a *caveat* against the last argument of my right hon. and learned friend. He suggested that under the Amendment the Committee is now discussing the High Court of the Commonwealth of Australia will not be a Court of co-ordinate jurisdiction with the Privy Council, and that it will be bound to follow the decisions of the Privy Council. I cannot feel by any means so clear as my right hon. and learned friend on that point, because we are here making a special provision for a special case. From the general right of appeal to the Privy Council to be granted we are excepting by statute one particular class of cases, questions involving the construction of the Constitution of the Commonwealth. Surely it will not only be within the power of, but also the duty and the right of the High Court to give full effect to that provision of the Australian Constitution, and to say, "We are in this particular matter made a final Court of Appeal. In all other matters we are undoubtedly a subordinate Court, unless in a particular matter we are made a Court of co-ordinate jurisdiction." They would say, "The only appeal is to lie from us, where we are satisfied there is some special reason; we are bound to carry out the intention of the people of Australia and of the Imperial Parliament in not going beyond the express provision; they have given no appeal unless special reasons, in our opinion, exist." I think, therefore, that it will be open to the High Court in future to hold that in this matter they are a Court not of subordinate jurisdiction but of co-ordinate jurisdiction. I cannot assent to the argument that, because they are subject to appeal in other cases, they are subject to appeal in this case also.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: They are subject to appeal in this case also; the only question is whether that appeal should be allowed and whether a special authorisation should exist.

MR. BRYCE: Excuse me; it is whether they have it in their power, if they so think fit, to depart from the position given to them of being the final Court of Appeal, and put themselves in the position of a subordinate Court. I think it necessary to enter a protest against the view the Attorney General has taken on this point. I do not suggest that that is a reason why the matter should be thrown into uncertainty again, and I have no desire to raise any difficulty if it can possibly be avoided, but I think it would have been a great deal better if we had passed the Bill as it came to us from Australia. If the words the Australians employed had been used, some difficulties and friction would have been avoided. As, however, we have now arrived at an arrangement which appears to be satisfactory to the great majority of the Australian colonies, I do not think there will be any general wish in the Committee to throw any impediment in the way of the final settlement of the matter.

MR. HALDANE: I am glad that the Government have come to a satisfactory settlement with so many of the Australian colonies. I gather that Queensland would still like a wider appeal, and that Western Australia and New Zealand would like the appeal to the Privy Council to stand as at present. I do not intend to propose any Amendment, but would only suggest that between now and the Report stage it should be considered whether the words which the delegates originally proposed should not be preserved as an independent clause without in any way derogating from what has been done. In that way I think the views and wishes of New Zealand, Queensland, and Western Australia might be materially assisted. The right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General has shown the few cases in Canada which cannot arise; but he has not shown the number of cases which may arise. I quite agree that the two Acts will be materially different Acts, but the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General and the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary must remember that the cases of *ultra vires* under this Bill, although they will arise in a different form, will be just like the Canadian cases of *ultra vires*. The first form of question that will have to be decided would be, "Is the particular statute under consideration within the legislative limits?" That would raise a common form of question under the Canadian Constitution. Then there would be other questions. Supposing the Commonwealth legislated, under this very wide power of legislating, as to fisheries and extra-territorial waters, then, I think, New Zealand may very easily have a question on which it would be right that it should have an unfettered power of appeal. The desire of New Zealand that it should have an unfettered right of appeal seems to me to be only a reasonable desire, and I suggest to the Government, respectfully but earnestly, that they should give more consideration than they have done to the question of maintaining the original words as proposed by the delegates, if necessary in a separate and independent clause. Not one word has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman or the Attorney General to lead us to think that the delegates object to their original words. As New Zealand would not object, and Queensland and Western Australia both apparently prefer some better form of the clause, the old words should still be embodied in the Bill. If they are not, the Government must take the responsibility, and I can only say that we must congratulate the Government on getting as much assent as they have got.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not wish to prevent my hon. and learned friend from having the honours of war, but at the same time, as he has made a further appeal to the Government, I must be permitted to point out that there appears to me still to be an absolute and entire ignorance of the wishes of those he professes to represent. His appeal to us is to insert into this clause or some other part of the Bill, or to reinsert certain words; and he appears to think that if we did that we should give satisfaction to New Zealand, Queensland, and Western Australia. I beg to say he is entirely mistaken. I do not think either of those great colonies cares one row of brass pins whether we put those words in or not. What do they care about? There is something they do care about; these colonies have not got everything they want. From the very first, as I explained to the House in the introduction of this Bill, Queensland has desired that the plenary right of appeal should be maintained exactly as it exists now, and they desire that no change whatever should be made. That is the position of Western Australia; that is the position of New Zealand. But the position of four out of the five federating colonies has been different; they have desired that there should be more or less restriction of appeal, and under those circumstances we have negotiated. I find myself in a difficulty in following the argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman. What has been his object in the part he has taken in this discussion? When, on the introduction of the Bill, I explained that the Government felt that Imperial interests were so seriously concerned in this matter that they could not give way altogether to the majority of the Australian federating colonies, and that, therefore, as they had been unable to arrange any agreement, they were forced to cut out the clause and to leave the right to appeal as it was before (that is to say, when we were giving to New Zealand, Queensland, and Western Australia, for whom the hon. and learned Gentleman is anxious, all that they were wanting) then the hon. and learned Gentleman got up and said that we were wrong, that he could not agree with us, and that we were in danger of incurring the displeasure of the Australian colonies. But when we come down now and say that all difficulty that existed is now disappearing, that we have amicably come to a unanimous conclusion, which Queensland is content to accept, which all the four colonies have accepted as well, which gives us all for which we ever contended in this House or elsewhere, and which gives to the colonies in Australia all which they severally think to be of importance, then the hon. and learned Gentleman is dissatisfied, and thinks that we have insufficiently considered the rights of Queensland and New Zealand. I daresay his position is clear to himself, but I am bound to say it is not clear to me. What I wish to impress on the Committee and on all parties to this controversy is that if, as I hope it will be, the decision of New South Wales is in accordance with the decision of the other colonies, we have—thanks very much indeed to the consideration which has been given to the matter and to the friendliness of the Australian delegates, who were appointed by their Governments, thanks to the general reasonableness of all parties and the desire to secure a unanimous agreement—dealt with what undoubtedly was an extremely difficult and complicated question in a manner which, at the end, we can say was satisfactory to all the parties concerned.

Question put, and negatived.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, to leave out from the word 'Act,' to the end of line 23."—(*Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I think we ought to have some explanation of why they were struck out. They were put in at the instance of the delegates, and perhaps the Attorney General or the Colonial Secretary will be able to tell us why now they should be struck out.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: My hon. and learned friend will observe that the Bill as it came from Australia contained the definition that "the colonies" should mean "the colonies of Australia." If it had not been for that definition I should have thought there would be no doubt that the Colonial Laws Validity Act would apply to Australia as it applied to the laws of the Dominion of Canada. It must be remembered that we are dealing not with one colony, but with the legislation of an assemblage of colonies; and we found, on conferring with the delegates, that it would be more acceptable to strike out the words containing the definition, which they thought were unnecessary.

Question put, and negatived.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Schedule :—

Amendments made.

MR. MACLEAN, who had the following Amendment on the Notice Paper—

> "In page 19, line 30, after 'exclusive,' to insert, 'Provided that any proposed laws for the granting of any such bounties shall be reserved by the Governor General for Her Majesty's pleasure,'"

said : I put this Amendment on the Paper not with the intention of carrying it to a division, but merely for the purpose of calling public attention to the very great change which the clause makes in the commercial policy of the Empire. Hitherto it has been accepted as the commercial policy of the Empire to have free trade in all these matters ; but power is reserved to the Australian Commonwealth to grant bounties on the production and export of Australian goods. I am aware that the whole Bill must be subject to the veto of the Queen in Council; but a veto of that kind is very seldom exercised. I am aware that it would be utterly useless for us to attempt to impose any restraint upon the Australian Commonwealth in these matters. We have given to the Commonwealth everywhere perfect freedom to tax themselves and to govern themselves, and even to enter into treaties with foreign Powers, and we cannot, therefore draw a line at a matter of this kind. Personally, I have sufficient faith in the principles of free trade to leave the matter to be settled by the Australians themselves. They will go their own course rejoicing in their own freedom and strength, and we can only hope that, as in the United States, whom we have seen adopt an economic blunder and still remain a prosperous country, a similar fate may be reserved for the Australian Commonwealth. Under the circumstances I do not propose to move the Amendment of which I had given notice.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman is entirely mistaken. This does not introduce any new principle whatever. Any single colony in Australia has already power to grant bounties, and as a matter of fact some of them have exercised it.

Schedule and Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and printed. [Bill 262.]

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs); Perhaps I may be allowed to ask the right hon. Gentleman when he proposes to introduce the complementary measure which we were told of more than a month ago as being ready to be introduced in a few days—I mean the measure adding certain Gentlemen to the Privy Council, and which was considered essential to the scheme.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It was not said to be essential—certainly not—but it was the desire of Her Majesty's Government, if such an arrangement could be made agreeable to the colonies, to make the arrangement I referred to on a previous occasion. But what I have to state now is that we are in communication with the Australian colonies through the Australian delegates, and we have not at present received information as to their desire on the subject. Therefore, I am really unable to give any further information. I think it is fair to say that I am led to understand that some further conference will be required in regard to this. It may be that the delay will make it impossible to bring in the Bill this session; but, at all events, the delay will not be with us. It will only be because the colonies desire a conference on the subject.

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to move that this Bill be recommitted in respect of Clause 19, which applies the Bill to Scotland. This clause was practically introduced by the Lord Advocate when the Bill was being considered by the House. Under Clause 10 of the Bill there may be a prosecution of a railway company in respect of any noncompliance with the rules which have been made under the Act, and in the case of prosecutions for breaches of those rules the clause provides that the same shall be tried in a summary manner under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, the object being that the trial should be a speedy and as far as possible an inexpensive one. In the case of England and Ireland the summary tribunal is the justices of the peace, with an appeal to Quarter Sessions. Where an appeal is made to the Quarter Sessions, that Court may review the matter both in regard to questions of law and fact, but there is a further appeal to the High Court on questions of law only. In Scotland the procedure of the English Act is not followed, because the Scotch Summary Procedure Act is somewhat different. At one time in Scotland we had a court consisting of justices of the peace and Quarter Sessions, but the law now in regard to these actions is that the case should be tried before the sheriff. The sheriff represents a status higher even in Scotland than that of the Quarter Sessions, so that in Scotland, instead of beginning with the justices and having an appeal to the Quarter Sessions analagous to the case of England, the prosecution is taken before the sheriff. Whereever any prosecution is taken before the sheriff his judgment as regards matters of fact is final, and an appeal to the High Court is only possible on a question of law. We are placed in this position—that in England you have two tribunals, the justices and the Quarter Sessions, and in Scotland the sheriff is superior to the English Quarter Sessions. As the Bill was brought in by the Government there would have been no appeal to the Quarter Sessions on matters of fact, and strangely enough the Amendment introduced by the hon. Member for Renfrewshire on behalf of the railway companies did provide for an appeal, but it was upon matters of law only. The Amendment of my hon. friend was not necessary at all, because, as the prosecution was to take place under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, they could appeal to the Quarter Sessions in any case. When the Report stage was reached the Lord Advocate put in a most unusual Amendment, and carried the right of appeal by the railway companies up to the High Court in regard to matters of fact as well as matters of law, and, in order to make a foundation for such an appeal to the High Court, he has had to alter what is the usual procedure in a summary case by the sheriff. In Clause 19 the Lord Advocate introduces a change by which the sheriff at the request of either party is to take notes of evidence. How is the summary character of the case to proceed if the sheriff, at the request of either party—and the railway companies may be relied upon to ask for notes—has to take notes of the evidence, and then those notes are to be laid before the Court of Session. They will have to be printed, and the Court of Session will, in the case of a breach of the rules, be able to review the case not only on matters of law, but also upon questions of fact. Look at the position of matters. If it be an offence in Scotland the railway companies have the right of review both on questions of law and of fact; but if the offence be in England or Ireland the railway companies have a right of review on questions of law only. Is there any reason why this Bill should prescribe that the prosecution is to be summary, while in the case of Scotland you deprive it altogether of its summary character? The Lord Advocate is depriving this clause of its summary character by introducing this new procedure, that in the case of the prosecution under the Summary Procedure Act the sheriff is to take notes of evidence, and the Court of Session is to have power to review on questions of fact as well as of law. I know the only thing that it is possible to say on the other side in regard to this proposal. It will be said that in the case of England there is an appeal from the justices to the Quarter Sessions, and you are going to say "We want an appeal also in Scotland." But it is a very different thing to give an appeal from the justices to the Quarter Sessions in England, because the Justices' Court is an inferior tribunal to begin with. It is a different thing to give an appeal from one legal body of that kind to another by giving an appeal to the High Court in a summary case on matters of fact. In the case of England you begin with the justices, and according to English procedure there is necessarily an appeal to the Quarter Sessions. That is a procedure which is quite applicable to England, but when you come to deal with Scotland you deal in a different way, because you make it compulsory that the sheriff shall be the only party entitled to try the case. If the law is wrong in one case, why not alter it in every other case? You have an appeal in England, because you begin with the justices, and you get an appeal to the Quarter Sessions, but in Scotland you begin with the sheriff, who is equal to the Quarter Sessions, and, therefore, the Summary Jurisdiction Act represents not an appeal from the sheriff on matters of fact but only on questions of law. The result is that in Scotland the prosecution practically ceases to be summary. It is provided that the sheriff has now to take notes of evidence, and those who have been in practice in the Sheriff's Court know the length of time taken by cases in which the sheriff has to take notes in his own handwriting. I have known a case of this kind spread over weeks and months, and the result of this provision will be that the summary character of the prosecution will be entirely done away with. Why should those who are prosecuting for a breach of the rule under this Bill in Scotland be handicapped by a sheriff being required to take these notes of evidence, and why should the parties be put to the expense of having to fight the case in the High Court in Scotland, while in the case of prosecutions in England and Ireland an appeal can only be made on questions of law, without reference to any review of the facts? I have put down an Amendment on the Paper to clause 19, page 6, line 39, to leave out from "1864," to the end of the sub-section, and the effect of the Amendment would be that it would leave an appeal to the High Court in Scotland the very same as an appeal to the High Court in England and Ireland. It would then be an appeal on questions of law merely and not on questions of fact. Certainly no sufficient reason has been given for this extraordinary change of the law, which is inconsistent with any procedure under the Summary Jurisdiction Act in Scotland, and which is also a great injustice to railway servants in Scotland.

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to second the proposition of my hon. friend below me. I believe this alteration was introduced by the Lord Advocate on the Report stage in this House. It is well known to Scotch Members that the Sheriffs' Court in Scotland corresponds more to the Quarter Sessions than to the Justices' Court, and it is a Court with which the Scotch suitors are entirely satisfied. The Lord Advocate's Amendment introduces a somewhat new method of procedure. It gives an appeal in Scotch cases only on questions of fact as well as law. We object to this on the ground that it takes away the summary character of the jurisdiction laid down by this Bill. It increases the right of appeal in Scotch cases as compared with English and Irish cases, and it may very materially increase the expenses in favour of the rich railway companies as against poor individuals. I hope the Lord Advocate will be able to offer some satisfactory explanation on the subject.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'now read the third time,' in order to add the words 're-committed in respect of Clause 19.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): With regard to the motion I made introducing this change, I wish to say that it stood on the Paper in the ordinary way, and I can assure my hon. friends opposite that my only reason for introducing this Amendment was to provide that the procedure in Scotland should be precisely the same in its true character as in England and Ireland. It has already been decided that for England there should be a right of appeal upon the facts as well as upon law, and I felt that to translate this into Scotch it was necessary to take the course I suggested. It is not a question of status or dignity, but the point is, shall we have in Scotland an appeal on the facts alone, or on both the facts and the law? If you are going to have an appeal on both, the only way it can be done, otherwise than by the course I have suggested, would have been much more cumbersome. Let me venture to correct the hon. Member for Mid Lanark, for he is not correct in saying that in all cases under the Summary Procedure Act there is no appeal. The hon. Member has evidently forgotten the provision made under the Summary Procedure Act of 1864. There are many instances of statutes creating offences allowing a right of appeal on matters of fact, and for which proceedings might be commenced under the Summary Procedure Act. You would not need the Summary Procedure Act for the purposes of an appeal, for you would present your appeal by virtue of the provision in the statute creating the offence. If you do give an appeal upon matters of fact it is necessary to make provision for taking the evidence. This taking of the evidence has been spoken of as a novelty, but it is not so, for there are many instances in which notes of the evidence have to be taken. May I be allowed to say that I think the system proposed is very much better than the English plan. The English plan is that, having examined the witnesses before the justices, on taking an appeal to the Quarter Sessions you do not present notes of the evidence, but you examine the witnesses all over again. I think that is a much more expensive process than the process of taking notes of the evidence and having an adjudication upon that. Accordingly, if you are going to have an appeal upon that in a summary manner the method I have put down is the correct way, and the same method obtains already in many statutes of the realm. From the starting point of the English Bill this is the only way to deal with it, unless I had taken the much more cumbersome method of giving a right of appeal on points of fact and another appeal on points of law. That would possibly have been more analogous to the English position, because under this Bill there is a possibility of two appeals—one on the facts and another to the High Court upon the law alone. I think it is very much simpler and better to do as we have done, and it is no novelty at all to provide for the taking of notes of evidence and thus have an appeal to the High Court upon points of law at once. I want to make it perfectly clear to the Committee that the right of appeal given in this proposal is in substance precisely the same appeal, although the particular tribunals used are different, because they cannot exactly correspond in Scotland.

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs): The point which has been put forward by my right hon. friend the Lord Advocate is not exactly that which we have put forward in this discussion. We desire, so far as we can, to make the state of things in the three countries analogous. The strong distinction which this Bill draws between Scotland and England and Ireland is this—that in the Bill as drawn in this clause we shall now have an appeal to the High Court in Scotland upon questions of fact and law, while in England and Ireland such a course will be absolutely impossible. In our procedure in Scotland I should say that in ninety-nine hundredths of the cases tried the sheriff is made the final judge of the facts. I do hope that my right hon. friend will take care to see that this clause is amended, and I will suggest to him that the Bill should be so recast upon this head as to take advantage of that most excellent statute which is known as the Summary Prosecutions Act of 1875. That Act applies in all prosecutions of a summary nature in every inferior Court in Scotland, and I observe in this clause that the Lord Advocate suggests that this prosecution is to be of the nature of a civil prosecution. The advantage of the reference which I respectfully give him is that, whereas criminal prosecutions would have to go to the High Court, civil prosecutions may go to either of the divisions of the Quarter Sessions, granted only that these superior Courts shall not be troubled with the details of the facts, but they will have to address themselves to questions of law alone. I venture to say that the calling of this proposal a summary prosecution is very contradictory. There will be an appeal upon such questions as whether a railway company can be fined or not for some delinquency discovered probably by a railway servant. The whole idea of summary jurisdiction is in the present instance particularly applicable, because what we want in reference to this Bill is that those delinquencies of railway companies shall be promptly and finally dealt with by the sheriff who considers the facts. I think it is a great public misfortune in Scotland that when these delinquencies are discovered we have to go through such a protracted procedure, which is detrimental to the public interest, and which in the case of railway servants might be of a most disastrous character.

MR. COLVILLE (Lanarkshire, N.E.): As this Bill now stands it establishes a very serious barrier in the way of getting these appeals speedily settled. The Lord Advocate has not made it clear to the House that in the case of Scotland there would be no greater hardship for a railway servant than in the case of England, where the appeal is made from the justices to the Quarter Sessions. If the Lord Advocate could assure the House that the cost of such an appeal would be restricted we should be quite satisfied, but I am afraid that railway servants will find themselves mulcted in serious costs. Of course if we are assured on this point our objection to this clause would be removed. I take it that the Lord Advocate does not purposely intend to penalise Scotch railway servants so that they would find it more costly to proceed under the Act than English railway servants.

Question put.

The House divided :— Ayes, 214; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 151.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Aird, John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gore
Barry, Rt. Hn. A. H. S. (Hunts)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Biddulph, Michael
Bill, Charles
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bonsor, Henry Cosmo Orme
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Gl'sg'w
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J Austin (Worc'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. E. T. D.
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William T.
Drage, Geoffrey
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Fry, Lewis
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Gilliat, John Saunders
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Gretton, John
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Hamilton, Rt Hon. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Hardy, Laurence
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, James
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon Hodge, Robert T.
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howard, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jackson, Rt. Hn. W. Lawies
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jenkins, Sir John Jones
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning- (Corn
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lea, Sir T. (Londonderry)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Sw'ns'a
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn, Walter (Liverpool.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David Liverpool)
Maclean, James Mackenzie
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'gh, W
M'Killop, James
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Edw. Wm. J.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milbank, Sir Powlett Chas. Jno.
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alex.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Pender, Sir James
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs, Newton
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. Curzon
Pollock, Harry Fredk.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter

Round, James
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Rutherford, John
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sidebottom, Wm. (Derbysh.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Sir H. M. (Lambeth)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry N.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, W. E. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taun'n
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Williams Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams, Jos. Powell- (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Commander (Berks, E.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Cameron, Sir Chas. (Glasgow)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Evans, Sir F. H. (Southampton
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edw. Temperley
Gurdon, Sir William B.
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
Hedderwick, Thos. Chas. H.
Holden, Sir Angus
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez E.
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.,
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U
Kearley, Hudson E.
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'l'nd
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Ewan, William
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Maddison, Fred.
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mather, William
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Moore, Arthur (Londonderry)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morgan, W. Pritchard (Merthyr
Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Montrose)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Oldroyd, Mark
Pilkington, Sir G A (Lancs S. W.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Briggs
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Richardson, J. (Durham, S. E.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Souttar, Robinson
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Sir William Henry
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Woods, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Caldwell and Mr.
Buchanan.

Main Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley): The House might have expected that the right hon. Gentleman in moving the Second Reading of this Bill would have vouchsafed some kind of explanation of the provisions it contains. On the First Reading the explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman was of the most perfunctory character, and he did not attempt more than to casually state one or two provisions of the measure, and did not in any way refer to some of its most important proposals. I certainly think the right hon. Gentleman has not treated either the House or the subject with which this Bill deals with the respect he ought. The Bill is certainly one which may be perfectly well described as a Bill without any principle whatever. It is an *omnium gatherum.* The right hon. Gentleman has gathered a large number of scraps together, and has thrown them into the Bill. I do not think there are any two clauses in it which have any connection with each other, and there is no general principle running through it. So far, however, as I can gather, the majority of the clauses, with the exception of Clause 2, are of a fairly reasonable character, and tend in the right direction. These clauses, however, are merely the coating and the sugar with which to administer the medicinal pill contained in Clause 2. I am quite sure that the proposal contained in Clause 2 is the main object of the Bill; that the other clauses are merely set out in order to make it more agreeable. The proposal in Clause 2 is of a novel character, and being of a novel character I think the right hon. Gentleman should have vouchsafed us some kind of explanation as to the policy of his Department in connection with it. When I say the proposal is novel, I mean that it is novel to this generation. It re-establishes in this country grants of public money for the building of denominational schools not in the hands of public bodies or under responsible control. I quite understood, and I think the country understood, that building grants were abolished once and for ever, and that they were never to be heard of again. Now we have a revival of the old custom condemned many years ago, the only difference being that the money is to be taken not out of the National Exchequer but out of the rates levied by boards of guardians. However, it is public money all the same, and we ought to have the same restrictions and the same principles applied to it. These grants are for the purpose of enlarging or building schools of a denominational character, in order to enable boards of guardians to have poor-law children educated in them. I acknowledge that the education of poor-law children is a problem of very considerable difficulty, but if I may be allowed to say so, I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman has taken a very wise course to secure its solution. Different boards of guardians adopt different policies with regard to poor-law children. Some boards keep them in the workhouses, others board them out in large numbers of thirty or forty in one place, while others again board them out in ones or twos. It is obvious that some boards of guardians will adopt this clause while others will not, and you will have as a result most unequal action all over the country. Some schools will be able to get public money granted them, while others with just as good a claim will be unable to persuade boards of guardians to apply money for this particular purpose. Again, suppose a board of guardians decides to enlarge a school to accommodate twenty children who require places, the Board of Education authorises the board of guardians to provide money for that purpose and they proceed to do so. That accommodation may be necessary to-day, but in five years time there may not be a single poor-law child attending that school. I certainly think that we may have a most reckless addition to our schools as a result of this clause, and we have no guarantee that boards of guardians will continue to carry out the same policy from year to year, or that even if they do it will produce the same effect in each village. Then we have another extraordinary novelty. Boards of guardians are asked to adopt a policy of contributing to the building or enlarging of schools in which poor-law children are to be educated. In the case of London we have the anomaly that money collected in the metropolis would be spent in Surrey, Kent, or Middlesex, where the schools may be situated. I think that is what is likely to occur, and if I am wrong it is because the right hon. Gentleman has not taken any means to secure that we should have any correct information as to the principle upon which this clause is based. Then there is another anomaly — another violation of a principle which is recognised as proper. If boards of guardians are asked to make these grants they should have some control over the schools which receive them. I think it will be a most iniquitous proceeding if the thin end of the wedge is now to be inserted by authorising grants-in-aid taken from the local rates without any control being given over the schools. I see in this proposal the beginning of a policy of using the rates of this country for the assistance of denominational schools, and using it without any *quid pro quo*, or without giving any control over the schools which receive these grants. I think this clause runs counter very seriously indeed to what we considered the policy of the Government and the Education Department was. I think we ought to have some explanation, and I sincerely hope that the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give us a satisfactory explanation, or a promise that proper safeguards will be provided. I will not now refer to the other clauses of the Bill. Most of them are of a satisfactory kind, but I believe that Clause 12 is the main proposal, and that if it is left as it stands it will very seriously affect the principle we thought animated the Education Department of this country, and will inflict very serious injury. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time on this day three months.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): Speaking generally, I view with the deepest satisfaction every clause in this Bill. I believe it is an admirable Bill from first to last, and I would wish to say one or two words in reply to the speech of the hon. Gentleman who moved its rejection. The Bill enables boards of guardians to send poor-law children to public elementary schools of all kinds. I happen to be the first man in England who sent any number of pauper children to public elementary schools. That was in June, 1872, and after twenty-eight years experience of this form of educating poor-law children, I can say it has been a most complete and absolute success. First of all, it gives the officers in the workhouses a period of quiet and peace, and it secures a certain amount of complete order during several hours of the day. It provides outside assistance for training these boys and girls, who get another form of discipline, which is altogether admirable. It gives the children a variety of life, and destroys that inertness — I might say almost soddenness—to which they are liable. It associates them with ordinary children in every-day life; they are no longer labelled as paupers, and their lives are made much happier and more natural. In these schools thus conducted I have found no absconding when the opportunity has been offered, and, therefore, if I was as much opposed to Voluntary schools as the hon. Gentleman opposite, I should feel bound to support this Bill, because of the great advantage it will confer upon pauper children by introducing a variety of life and discipline into their training. I will not refer to the other clauses. I think they are in every way satisfactory, and that the necessities of the situation have called forth every one of them.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): This Bill is full of technical points which will require explanation before it obtains a second reading. There are one or two criticisms which I desire respectfully to offer. The clause to which my hon. friend the Member for Morley referred appears to me to be an admirable clause in regard to certain classes of schools. The tendency of boards of guardians seems to be to disband their pauper schools and to board their children out. One can conceive of a board of guardians of a great city boarding out their pauper children in a village a few miles out, and sending these children to the public elementary school. The accommodation in the village school will thereby be swamped, and additional accommodation and additional expense will become necessary. In fact in some villages a new school, or at least a new department, will have to be built. I take it that the object of the clause is to make it lawful for the board of guardians to provide or contribute towards the cost of the additional accommodation. That is a perfectly proper thing when it applies to village board schools, because in these there is every guarantee, by public audit and public management, that the money voted by the board of guardians will be spent on the school, and nothing but the school. But in an indirect way this raises the question of rate-aid to voluntary schools. I should be out of order if I were to discuss that principle, as a principle; but I may be allowed to say that I should not look with hostility upon the extension of rate-aid to voluntary schools, under certain proper and essential conditions—namely, that the board of guardians or whatever the rating authority may be—should have the right to appoint on the committee of management of the school to be so aided from the rates a representative or representatives, and that they should have the right of auditing or requiring the Local Government auditor to audit the accounts of the school. If that were done, the risk of determined opposition to the clause in question would be withdrawn. I will not say many words in regard to the provisions which extend the powers of compulsory school attendance, which widen the net to bring in truant boys, increase the attendances under what are known as dunce certificates, and raise the penalties which may be inflicted on parents for neglecting to send their children to school. The school board of the city which I have the honour to represent has already communicated with the Board of Education on Clause 4, Sub-section 1. By Clause 4 the local authority—that is, the school board —is empowered to pay the expense of the conveyance of children who are sent, under the Education Acts, to a certified industrial school. That is a very proper thing, but I would point out that hitherto where that has been done it has usually been done my means of a policeman. That is to say, that children sent to an industrial school, not necessarily as the result of crime or misdemeanour, but of truancy or a comparatively trifling offence, have been so sent in the charge of the police. I wish that there could be added to this Bill, in respect of the attendance clause, a proviso that all school attendance cases and punishments arising from these should be heard and determined in another than the ordinary police court. The present practice has, I feel, a bad moral effect on the children. I hope the Government will accept in Committee an amendment in the direction I have indicated, so that the boys who are sent to an industrial school and conveyed there at the expense of the board of guardians may be sent in charge of the board's own visiting officer. With these remarks I extend to this Bill my support, and give my thanks to the Government for having introduced it.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I agree with the hon. Member for West Nottingham that many of the provisions of this Bill will be of great advantage to education, and will be welcomed by all those who are anxious to strengthen the law with reference to attendance. But it is a point of some importance to know where we are going, and to understand more fully what will be the actual result of these proposals. Now, in the first place, I am quite sure that all those who are acquainted with the present state of educational administration would deprecate the introduction of fresh authorities, and the opening up of fresh conflicts of jurisdiction, by conferring new functions on new authorities in any direction conflicting with existing authorities. If any useful result is to be expected from the Board of Education Act of last year, it ought to be in the direction of unifying the authorities and the machinery in order to get the best possible results. The objection I take to Clause 2 is that it pretty much places on the boards of guardians, indirectly it is true, the right and the duty to provide further accommodation when deficiency of places arises in educational districts. Well, that seems to be a new departure which I much deprecate. It would be very undesirable to interfere, in my opinion, with the existing powers of school boards to provide accommodation, or to thus extend the action of boards of guardians in making the necessary provision for sending the children to ordinary elementary schools. If that most desirable policy is to be fully carried out the proper course would be to adhere to the principle of the Act of 1870, that where there is a deficiency of accommodation the school board should afford the provision of buildings as the authority representing the ratepayers of the district, and that they alone should have the power to deal with the question. The clause as it stands is open to the very serious objection that it enables the board of guardians to subsidise denominational schools, and to provide money out of the rates for an increase of accommodation in denominational schools without any consultation with the ratepayers, or recognising in any way the principle of control by the ratepayers, or without providing any modification whatever of the conditions under which these schools are carried on. It would mitigate the objection on this side of the House to some extent if the boards of guardians were entitled to elect representatives to serve upon the committee of management of such schools. I must at once say, however, to the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President that that would not meet the whole of my objections to this clause. Unless the clause can be explained in a different sense from that in which its effect has been interpreted I think it will meet with very considerable opposition in Committee.

Mr. STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): While I entirely approve of facilities being afforded to poor-law children for attending ordinary public elementary schools, where that is possible, as provided for in Clause 2, I feel that there might have been included in the Bill the other side of the picture in which both sides of the House are very considerably interested—namely, the permission to the placing of poor-law schools under the Elementary Education Act, where the board of guardians desires it, and the Local Government Board approves it. I have no doubt the two right hon. Gentlemen responsible for the Local Government Board and for the Board of Education are very well able to arrange a clause by which that could be carried out. I have brought before the House, on a very recent occasion, this very question, and I know that many Members on both sides are interested in it. It is not a party question. The children in poor-law schools do not receive any of the advantages of being under the Board of Education. They are, as we all know, examined and inspected by inspectors under the Poor Law Board and the Local Government Board, and their education is extremely inferior. Many of us are of opinion that the education of these children will never be satisfactorily dealt with unless they are brought under the general educational scheme of the country, and they and their masters are placed under the inspection of the Board of Education itself. Clause 2 goes a certain way in that direction, but only a small way. Even if these poor-law schools were to be broken up, it would take many years to bring them under the ordinary educational system of the country. I do not intend to traverse all the arguments brought forward in Committee of this House in a previous debate, but I would remind the House that these children are at present under a great disadvantage as compared with the other children from an educational point of view. The Local Government Board has no facility for inspecting or managing the education of these children. It has no accumulated experience; but the Board of Education has that accumulated experience. I would be glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman who is in charge of this Bill or from some other Member of the Government an expression of their willingness to introduce into the Bill a clause to accomplish that which the guardians and the Local Government Board are willing and desirous to do, namely, to declare that the schools under the poor-law authorities are public elementary schools as far as the teachers are concerned, and also as far as the examination and inspection of the children are concerned. This is a very important point, and affects many thousands of children under the care of the 600 unions in the country. It has been said that these are merely barrack schools, contaminatory in their character and accompanied by the workhouse taint; but, on the contrary, the boards of guardians who are most forward in the matter, such as those of Birmingham and some of the districts of London, are most anxious that they should be placed under the Board of Education for inspection and control, instead of under the Local Government Board. Those boards which have devoted a great deal of money and attention to the creation of schools, such as that at Hornchurch in the neighbourhood of London, where colonies have been founded for the separate home system, are doing their best to train the children in a manner which will enable them in the future to best meet the circumstances of life. But they find that they cannot get the children taught up to the standard of other children unless they are brought under the ordinary educational system of the country. I trust the Government may see their way to expand the scope of Clause 2.

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): Speaking in regard to this Bill as a whole, I do not think that anybody, on whatever side of the House he may sit, will deny that nearly all its provisions are good and valuable, with, perhaps, one exception. I regret, myself, that the Bill has been complicated by the introduction of the rather unfortunate clause to which not unnaturally a considerable amount of attention and suspicion has been given. The right hon. Gentleman would have facilitated this discussion if he had made some slight explanation of the Bill in moving the Second Reading. As it is, it has been flung down without any guidance from him as to the course of the discussion. My right hon. friend might have foreseen, being familiar with the history of education in this House, that any proposals to enable public bodies to vote money to Voluntary schools are certain to be very closely watched, not merely on this but on the other side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman must recollect the controversy that was aroused by the proposal to enable boards of guardians to pay fees of children under the 25th Clause of the Education Act of 1870. The provision in this Bill may go a great deal further than that proposal of former years, and the only way to mitigate or avoid the not unnatural suspicion which animates Members on this side of the House would be to adopt the suggestion made by two of my hon. friends—namely, that some representation should be given to the boards of guardians, or some other public representative authority—the rural council, or the school board, as the case may be—so that the board of guardians who vote the money might feel that they have some control over the establishments to which their money is given. Where in a case of this kind you are going to draw upon a fresh fund for Voluntary schools, surely we are entitled to ask that some form of representative control should be introduced into the poor-law schools. When the Bill gets to Committee Amendments will be placed upon the Paper. Nobody complains of the procedure of my hon. friend in moving the rejection of the Second Reading in order to raise a full discussion, but I hope my hon. friend will be satisfied with the discussion he has raised, and having regard to the other propositions in the Bill, will not press the rejection; and I hope the Vice-President of the Council will understand that when the Bill gets into Committee the second clause will be closely examined.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): This Bill contains some excellent provisions, but there is one aspect of Clause 2 which I do not think has received sufficient attention in this House. I allude to the effect that it will probably have all through the country, and the change, to a great extent, under which guardians and rural district councillors will be elected. This clause will probably have the effect of making these elections bitterly contested on sectarian and non-sectarian lines. It is true that Clause 2 is partial in its character, but that very fact will cause opinion to divide, and the bitterest feelings will be raised. It is practically a recommencement of the old system of building grants, which we thought had been entirely and absolutely got rid of. I am afraid the effect upon the elections of local governing bodies all over the country will be extremely prejudicial. I hope, however, that my hon. friend, having regard to other proposals in the Bill, will not press his motion to a division.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I did not abstain from making a speech in moving the Second Reading of the Bill from any disrespect to the House, but because, the measure being a Departmental one and containing a number of what I had fondly imagined to be purely non-controversial amendments to the law, I thought that, on the whole, it would be more respectful to the House to await the observations which hon. Members might wish to make before thrusting myself upon their notice. Unless I had heard the speeches delivered by hon. Members opposite, I should never have dreamt that it was possible to conceive that there was such a diabolical plan underlying so innocent a clause. Perhaps I might explain to the Committee exactly the reason of this perfectly innocent clause. The clause originated in the conviction of the Education Department of the enormous advantage of poor-law children going to the ordinary elementary schools of the country and mixing with other children. The hon. Member for North Birmingham, who has had great experience, said the best system for the education of pauper children was to divest them as far as possible of their pauper surroundings, and give them the same education as the children of the village. In carrying out that principle experience proved that great injustice might be done to certain parishes. As an instance, I might mention a case which came long ago within my own experience. A poor-law union in the county of Essex, with a very small workhouse and very few children, had the children taught within the walls of that institution by the best of teachers. The parish, however, became a school board district, and the school board built a school which was attended by the children from the workhouse, and is attended by them, so far as I know, to this day. But why should the ratepayers of the parish have to bear the expense, which ought to be borne by the union ? That is, I think, a very great injustice to a small rural parish. The same state of things exists in a number of rural parishes in this country, and the object of the clause is to enable the guardians to do what they have no legal power to do at present—namely, to contribute both to the building and the maintenance of the school. A great number of metropolitan unions now adopt the laudable practice of boarding out their children in country parishes. Where only one or two children are boarded out in a particular parish, no burden is imposed on the inhabitants of that parish, but when a considerable number of children are boarded out in a small parish, increased expense is entailed on the managers of the school. If it is for the interest of the ratepayers to send their children out into the country, it is only reasonable that they should subscribe to the country schools where the children are educated. Nobody ever dreamt of subsidising voluntary schools or reviving building grants or introducing into the election of guardians strong sectarian elements. I do not think the clause would have any such effect. It is a permissive clause. I think boards of guardians may be trusted to take precautions to prevent the use of their money for sectarian purposes. Suggestions have been made that provisions should be put into the Bill requiring boards of guardians to be represented on the committee of the school, and requiring some sort of public audit of the accounts. Let the House imagine one of the great London unions—Poplar or Shoreditch, for instance—having children boarded out in Essex, Kent, or Surrey, and being directed to appoint somebody to represent them on the management of the school, and provision having to be made for the audit of a school account amounting, perhaps, to only £100. What a burden would be thrown upon boards of guardians.

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: What I suggested with regard to auditing was that the accounts of the school should be subjected to the ordinary audit by the official auditors.

Sir J. GORST: It is all very well for the Local Government Board auditor to audit the accounts of great schools, but to require a small parish school to have its accounts audited every year by a Local Government Board auditor would put on the managers of the school an additional burden which they are quite unable to bear. The whole matter is optional, and if a board of guardians is not satisfied that every security is afforded for the proper expenditure of their contribution they can withhold that contribution. I will consider any Amendment proposed in Committee, and the House will have further opportunities of considering this clause, but I hope they will not be induced by these vain and unreasonable fears to omit from the Bill this most important and salutary clause. As to sending children to industrial schools, I think that everything that can be done ought to be done to detach children altogether from the ordinary administration of the criminal law in this country. If I was one of a bench of magistrates, I would not like to send a child to an industrial school in charge of the police; I agree with the view that the attendance officer is a far fitter person to be entrusted with such a task; but it is another matter to prevent by Act of Parliament the police under any circumstances taking a child to an industrial school. If the House will read the Bill a second time, I propose that it should be referred to the Standing Committee on Law, where there will be an opportunity of discussing in detail technical clauses. Of course, the House will have the opportunity on Report of reconsidering any matter of principle, and giving its final decision on the clauses.

Mr. BROADHURST (Leicester) said he should not have intervened in the debate had it not been for the reference made to the Essex parish which the right hon. Gentleman had alluded to. If the whole of the education of the country was administered in the wise, liberal and statesmanlike manner that it was by the vicar of the parish in question, there would be no word of suspicion as to what was being done. But all parishes are not so fortunate, and he feared that in some cases advantage might be taken of this measure for sectarian purposes.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

MONEY-LENDING BILL [Lords].

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): I beg to move the Second Reading of this Bill, and in so doing perhaps I ought to explain how it is that I come to be in charge of such a measure. It has nothing to do with local government, and I move the Second Reading because for two sessions I presided over the Select Committee which inquired into the whole matter. Apart from that inquiry and the light thrown by it, I have no special knowledge of the subject. I took Shakespeare's advice: I have never been a borrower or a lender. But when I went to preside at that Committee, I went believing as a free trader, that there should be free trade in money as in everything else, and that if a man chose to be a fool it was impossible to save him from his own folly. I entered the Committee holding those views very strongly, but I must confess that two sessions upstairs of rather exciting work cured me entirely of these heresies. I found instead of representing free trade in money it frequently represented free trade in rascality and fraud. The provisions of this Bill are not aimed at legitimate money-lending, with which no one desires to interfere. I will give the House two illustrations that came before the Committee of the system against which the Bill is directed. An unfortunate Irish landowner named Finlay borrowed a sum of £300 from a money-lender, for which he gave a promissory note for £456, the money being repayable in monthly instalments. Mr. Finlay paid several instalments regularly, and then for a subsequent instalment the cheque was sent a single day late. The cheque was returned and the whole amount claimed. Default interest was charged, and when Mr. Finlay came before the Court he had been compelled to pay, besides £114 in instalments, a sum of £600—£714 in all—for the loan of £300 from 13th November, 1890, to 20th February, 1892. All that was done within the four corners of the law. This was not one of the Gordon cases, but the second case was. In the other case an English farmer named Adams borrowed £50 from Isaac Gordon in November, 1892, and signed a promissory note for £200. Further advances were made of £50 in February, 1893, of £20 in June, and of £50 in November, 1893. Between November, 1892, and September, 1894, Mr. Adams paid £461, and in October, 1894, Gordon claimed that £500 was still owing in respect to an advance of £220. This shows what is possible under the present law. Gordon took proceedings in the County Court at Birmingham on one promissory note. Whilst these were pending a bailiff came and took possession of Mr. Adams's property, Gordon, who had an office in Glasgow, having proceeded against Mr. Adams there without his knowledge in connection with a second promissory note. By a proceeding which, I believe, is called "summary diligence," Mr. Adams was sold up and ruined. The Committee listened to many other cases of a similar character to these. It has been made a matter of complaint that they had not heard cases of legitimate money-lending, but that was because they were only commissioned to inquire into these cases of hardship. After hearing the evidence the Committee came to the following conclusion—

> "After carefully considering the evidence which has been given in regard to particular transactions and the general expressions of opinion of persons so well qualified to form a judgment as Sir Henry Hawkins, Sir James Charles Mathew, Sir George Lewis, the Inspector General in Bankruptcy, and the County Court Judges, your Committee have unhesitatingly come to the conclusion that the system of money lending by professional money-lenders at high rates of interest is productive of crime, bankruptcy, unfair advantage over other creditors of the borrower,

> extortion from the borrower's family and friends, and other serious injuries to the community.
>
> "And although your Committee are satisfied that the system is sometimes honestly conducted, they are of the opinion that only in rare cases is a person benefited by a loan obtained from a professional money-lender, and that the evil attendant upon the system far outweighs the good.
>
> "They therefore consider that there is urgent need for the interposition of the legislature with a view to removing the evil."

That being the view of the Committee, and the Government as well, the question arises is the Bill adequate, and does it proceed on proper lines? There are clauses to which, I believe, no objection can be taken. There are clauses dealing with the registration of money-lenders, which seek to enact that a money-lender must be registered and must trade under one name only, as it was proved that a favourite mode was to carry on business under different names in different towns. But the real issue is not in these clauses at all. The first question is, should there be legislative interference? I say the Bill answers that. The second question is, ought the principle which is embodied in the Bill in Clause 1—the principle which enables the Judges of the country to review and revise certain contracts—to prevail? The Committee came to a very clear pronouncement upon that. The Committee consisted, I think, of fifteen members, and there was one dissentient to the paragraph I am about to read. They state—

> "After considering the whole of the evidence your Committee have arrived at the conclusion that the only effective remedy for the evils attendant on the system of money-lending by professional money-lenders is to give to the Courts absolute and unfettered discretion in dealing with these transactions."

Section 1 of the Bill carries out this recommendation. It is important to bear in mind exactly what Section 1 proposes to do. There is an idea that Section 1 provides that if a money-lender lends money at a rate of interest exceeding that which is in the schedule of the Bill he willl break the law, and that it will be impossible for him to recover. This is not the case. First of all, no case can come up for review unless the rate of interest set out in the schedule of the Bill has been exceeded; but that is not all. No case can come up for review and revision unless, in addition to the interest being in excess of the scheduled rate, the Court has reason to believe that the transaction in itself is harsh and unconscionable. The House will bear in mind that there are two conditions; first, the rate of interest must be beyond the rate provided in the schedule, and secondly the court must come to the conclusion that the transaction is a harsh and unconscionable transaction. I believe these terms are known to the law, although I am not a lawyer. If these two conditions are fulfilled, and only in such case, the court may set aside, vary, or cancel the contract. I am aware that there are hon. Members in the House who deny that there ought to be interference, and who have the same view to-day as that with which I started on the inquiry, but if there is to be interference at all, and if we are to be saved from the scandal under the present law—because it is a scandal—I do not think any Bill could be more rigidly and more closely safeguarded than this Bill is. The outstanding question, and I admit it is a fair one to argue, is—Is this power of revision and review a power which ought to be conferred on the Judges of the country? The Committee at all events practically decided with one dissentient that it was a power which ought to be given. It was strongly recommended and supported by Lord Brampton, then Sir Henry Hawkins, who was examined before the Committee, by Sir George Lewis, who, perhaps, has had more experience in matters of this kind than any living man, and who gave the strongest and clearest evidence that this was the only principle which would at all touch the evil. It was recommended by Judge Lumley Smith, a most experienced county court judge, Sir Frederick Falkiner, Recorder of the City of Dublin, the Chief Registrar in Bankruptcy of Ireland, and by Mr. Roxburgh, assistant judge at the Lord Mayor's Court in London. The Committee quite recognised that this was a serious power to confer, but they were greatly strengthened in recommending it by the fact which was proved in evidence by every lawyer who was examined, that this very power is now exercised in the Court of Chancery in regard to expectant heirs, and I believe, at least the evidence stated, that the principle has been carried very much further in the courts than that. It is not a new principle that is introduced by the Bill for the first time, and I am bound to say that in the Courts where these cases are principally heard there is the widest discretion already existing and which is sometimes used in a way that is open to question. I refer to the County Courts. The County Courts are largely in those matters courts of arbitration, and what is happening every day in these places? These hard bargains come before the County Court Judges. They see and feel the hardship of the bargain, and they endeavour to do their best with such powers as they have to save the people from utter ruin and destruction. What do they do? Why, anyone reading the newspapers can see what is done in many of these courts. The Judge sees the hardship and fixes the period of the payment of the instalments for a long time. He orders the debtor to pay one shilling a week, in some cases sixpence a week, and discretion of that kind is really more serious for the money-lender than the discretion which the Bill will confer. There is an idea current also which ought to be corrected—that this Bill fixes the rate of interest and practically re-enacts the old usury law. It does nothing of the kind. That proposal was made by Mr. Justice Mathew, and he argued the case most strongly before the Committee that it would be infinitely better to fix the rate at 10 per cent. than to vest any such discretion in the Judges. Probably if we had fixed the rate of interest in the Bill, there would have been considerable objection to it, and the Committee, at all events, declined to adopt that suggestion, and reported in favour of the discretion which is to be found in the Bill. This ought also to be borne in mind. There is another idea current, and I am bound to say money-lenders themselves hold that the money-lender is confined to the rate of interest set out in the Bill. Nothing of the kind. If he charges a rate of interest in excess of that in the schedule, and a case is brought into court, there must, in addition to that, be a harsh and unconscionable case made out, and I think that is a very great safeguard. I have tried to explain the Bill. It is not a complicated measure, and I think it deals very effectively with a great evil. I have no desire, and I am sure no one who sat on the Committee has any desire, to deny the difficulties that surround the question. If the House gives the Bill a Second Reading, there will be abundant room for legitimate Amendments in Committee, and I am perfectly certain that those in charge of the Bill are ready in all matters of detail to keep an open mind. I am sure that anything short of giving the Court absolute and unfettered discretion in such cases would not be a remedy worth the paper the Bill is printed on, and it is because I believe this that I confidently move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

MR. BIRRELL (Fifeshire, W.): I am sorry that the duty of moving the rejection of the Bill should devolve on me. A few months ago I had much brighter hopes. That distinguished man, Sir Edward Clarke, would have moved the rejection of the Bill; but he has thought fit to resign his seat, and he has thereby impoverished our debates, and without, so far as I can see, either strengthening or weakening the position of Lord Roberts in the field of action. Failing Sir Edward Clarke, I had hopes that the rejection of the Bill would be moved by a distinguished lawyer who sat opposite me, but he also is gone, although I am told that somebody very like him may still be seen in another part of the House. For my purpose he is worse than dead. He would have moved the rejection of the Bill, but now he will be most infallibly bound to vote in favour of it. However, conscious of my many shortcomings and infirmities, I am going to ask the House to bear with me while I risk becoming a pedant or a bore. I shall ask hon. Members to do what they never like doing, and that is, to keep separate and distinct two things which have nothing whatever to do with one another, and which I think are muddled and mixed up in this measure. These two things are, the rate of interest which people may charge for the use of money, and fraud, deception, oppression, concealment of material facts, or any other term which may be used to describe fraud and deceit. I hope the Members of the House will endeavour to keep these two things separate and distinct in their minds. The price you charge for the use of money is, of course, known as usury. I quite agree that there is an enormous amount of literature existing on the subject of usury, and a great many people of the utmost wisdom have an objection to usury altogether. The greatest lawyer that ever lived—Moses—I cannot tell the Attorney General what his emoluments were—forbade usury altogether among the chosen people; but he also did what the Bill does not do. Moses forbade pawnbroking, because he distinctly told them that if any of the people took a pledge from his neighbour, his blanket or his clothing, as soon as the sun went down he should return it to him, so that he might be covered during the night. For centuries the Christian Church forbade access to the Mass to all usurers, even though they disguised themselves under the name of bankers. Bankers did not "lend money" within the meaning of this Bill, but the Christian Church knew of no such subterfuge. After the Reformation, many of the Protestant Churches adopted the same rule. Learned treatises on the subject may still be found which it is well worth while to read. Strong views were entertained against usury by Mr. John Ruskin, who advocated all the doctrines that were most unpopular to the spirit of the time, and in regard to whom, therefore, I need scarcely say a very strong feeling indeed found utterance in *The Times* on the proposal that so great a man should be buried in Westminster Abbey. However that may be, experience proves that usury continued and interest was still charged on money, and so the subject came to be investigated by thinkers and philosophers. The idea very soon sprang up that you should adopt a limit of legal interest, and that was the practice for a long time. First, prohibition was tried, then regulation; but in this country thinkers, among whom were Hume and Adam Smith, demonstrated in a most convincing manner that any attempt to interfere by law directly or indirectly with the rate which one man was to charge another for the use of his money was not only absurd but was injurious to the borrower, the person who most stands in need of it. I must confess I had thought that Jeremy Bentham, in his celebrated "Defence of Usury," published in 1816, had given the *coup de grâce* to the notion which is found in this Bill. A Select Committee of this House in 1818 sat upon this question, and, although I have no desire to say a word against reform in Parliament, the Report of that Committee of the old unreformed Parliament contrasts very favourably with the more democratic procedure of the present day. That Committee directly recommended the abolition of the usury laws. That change took a considerable time in this country; but in 1854 every appearance of them disappeared altogether, and there has been nothing in this country since in any way suggesting what interest should be charged for the use of money. But the abolition of the usury laws in no way affected the doctrines of our Courts as to the effect of fraud or deception upon any transaction in which it might be proved by proper evidence that fraud or deception had appeared. I always like, when I can, to clothe my own crude ideas in judicial language, because it imparts dignity to debate which it would not otherwise possess. I should like to read the observations made by a distinguished judge, Sir John Stuart, in the case of Barratt *v.* Hartley, shortly after the repeal of the usury laws—

> "It is an observation of some importance, now that the usury laws are repealed, that one effect of such repeal was to bring into operation, to a greater extent than formerly another branch of the jurisdiction of the Court which existed long before—I mean that principle of the Court which prevented any oppressive bargain, or any advantage, exacted from a man under grievous necessity and want of money from prevailing against him. Whoever has attended to the subject must have seen that the moment the usury laws were repealed the lender of money became enabled to exact anything he pleased in the name of interest—from that moment the jurisdiction of the Court was likely to be called into active operation."

That is the point I wish to call the attention of the House to. We are asked to amend the law, but what is the law at the present time? I am the more emboldened to ask this question because this wonderful Committee over which my hon. friend presided did not know, and many of its members remained from beginning to end in complete ignorance of, what the law of England is at the present moment on this subject. For centuries the common law of England has vitiated every transaction in which it was found that fraud had entered or had contributed to the making of the transaction. It is an insult to the common law of this country to suggest that anybody can practise fraud or deceit and come into

Court and get the benefit of the bargain. Our rude ancestors, however, held that it was not enough for a man to come into Court snivelling and whining and saying that he had been cheated; he was required to prove it. That is one of the reasons why I to-day offer the greatest possible objection to the Bill. If you can prove fraud or deception, suppression of material facts, or show in any way that the lender is taking advantage of the borrower, or that he has forced the contract upon him, the lender cannot make good his claim in any Court of the country. Consider what you have already done in this House by statute. So long ago as 1874 this House passed a law whereby a contract for the loan of money to any infant whatever was declared *ab initio* void, and was incapable of ratification or confirmation on the infant attaining full age. Indeed, in 1892, inspired by that hysteria which seems to be the characteristic of the closing years of the century, we passed another Act declaring that anyone who sends a circular offering to lend money to an infant may be sent to prison as a felon for three months, although the person offering money may have reason to suppose that the infant is of full age. This Bill seeks to make the punishment even more severe. Infants have already received the most complete protection that it is possible to give I quite admit that it is a babyish age, and if people think that the age ought to be extended I would offer no objection to the period of infancy being twenty-five years. As one having considerable experience in drawing up wills, I know that is now the age almost invariably selected by testators with large estates or property as that at which their offspring should attain their majority. I knew a case of a man who fixed fifty-two as the age, and the son when he reached that age gave a party to celebrate the occasion, at which everyone was present except the trustees, of whom, he frankly said, he had seen quite enough. It is within the power of testators, if they think proper, to extend the age beyond twenty-one, but the protection of infants does not stop there. The doctrines of our Courts of equity, which are now the doctrines of our Courts of law, have been stretched to their furthest limits for the protection of borrowers. Therefore I am prepared to assert that if you can prove fraud or oppression, if you can prove a harsh or unconscionable bargain amounting to evidence of fraud, the laws of this country are not in the lamentable position which this excited Committee would have us believe they are in. If a person is in a position to show that he has been cheated or got the better of in an unfair manner, he has no difficulty whatever in getting rid of his bargain. If we come to the Bill itself we find a very inflammatory preamble. There was a time when this House objected to a preamble; I never object to the preamble of a Bill; it is often the only interesting part of a measure. That very distinguished historian, Mr. Froude, has written a History of England in twelve volumes, chiefly from the preambles of Acts of Parliament in the reign of Henry VIII. I ask the House to look at the preamble of this Bill, in order to judge of the spirit in which the Committee upstairs approached the consideration of this subject. The words are—

> "Whereas certain persons trading as, and known by the name of, money-lenders"

—well, anyone who lends money is a money-lender—

> "carry on their business of lending money by deceptive methods, and inflict by harsh and unconscionable bargains great injury upon those who borrow money from them; and it is expedient that such money-lenders and their methods of carrying on such business of money-lending should be subject to control," etc.

I do not hesitate to say that you could have a Bill with respect to borrowers in the preamble of which every word I have just read might be said of them.

> "Whereas certain persons trading as, and known by the name of, money borrowers carry on their business of borrowing money by deceptive methods, and inflict by harsh and unconscionable bargains great injury upon those who lend money to them."

That is not the way in which a question of this sort should be approached. This Committee had a very great deal of very good evidence and sound sense put before them in the course of their proceedings, but they would not listen to it. There was his Honour, Judge Collier, a man who had been County Court judge in Liverpool for twenty-four years. His evidence was that the people of Liverpool knew perfectly well what they were about when they borrowed money from these people. He says—

> "They borrow money at the beginning of the week; they pay it with the interest, which is hardly ever less than a penny in the shilling a week, on the Saturday, and then on the Monday they borrow it again."

In reference to the discretion this Bill proposes to vest in County Court Judges, he says—

> "I think it would lead to enormous litigation, because there would not be a case in the County Court in which the people would not try to get the order set aside on the ground that the charge was unconscionable."

This evidence of Judge Collier as to the character of the people of Liverpool seemed to be rather too much for some members of the Committee, and they put it down to the extraordinary intelligence of Liverpool. A member puts it to him in this way—

> "The population of Liverpool is an artisan population, rubbing their wits together, and you would describe them as decidedly a sharp population, would you not?—Oh, I should think so, certainly."

As a native of Liverpool I have no objection to Liverpool being regarded as radiating with wisdom, so that people twenty miles away are able to get the better of a money-lender, but I hardly think that is the true explanation. My own opinion is that if I were a money-lender I would far rather carry on my business in a large city than in a country district. I do not think the quiet intelligence of the country people is so apt to be deceived as the quick-witted artisan population of Liverpool. But that is an example of how the Committee seemed bent not only not to hear evidence showing the legitimacy of a great deal of money-lending, but to put almost a kind of pressure upon every witness who came before them to speak of the horrors of the practice. I must confess that they got one witness, at least, who fooled them to the top of their bent. There was a distinguished man, Sir Henry Hawkins, now Lord Brampton, who told them a story. I could really hardly believe, if I had not read it in a Blue-book, that a Judge of his great distinction, who has been a member of the Bench for I do not know how many years, who has presided over I do not know how many assizes, who has condemned I do not know how many human beings to death, should have thought so little of a Parliamentary Committee as to tell them this story—

> "I will give you one instance that occurred to my own knowledge. I was placed in a very painful position to know what to do with the man, and ultimately I did deal him out as light a sentence as I could conscientiously do under the circumstances. He was a man who was in a very respectable position; he had married a wife, a very nice woman, who was very much attached to him and he to her; his income was very small, that is to say, £200 a year—some very small income at all events; he tried to do the best he could to make a good home for her; the result was that the first year he a little exceeded his income—not much (£40 or £50); he had recourse to a money-lender (these transactions came before me) at a large rate of interest. Naturally, as anybody who knew his circumstances and position would expect (he never thought of it), at the end of the year he was worse off than at the beginning, because he owed more interest than the loan amounted to. Under those circumstances he thought he would avail himself of the chances of the turf, and he backed a horse or horses at very large odds—I think it was 100 to 1, or something of that sort. Well, anybody who thought of the matter would think it was really a 100 to 1 chance whether he ever made anything out of it; but he looked upon it as a dead certainty. When the race was run he not only lost his few pounds that he had put on the horses, but was worse off still; there was his debt to the money-lender still due; he had hoped to pay it off with his turf winnings. The result was that he was put to his wits' end. I have no doubt he was intending to be honest, that is to say in the result, but unfortunately he had the means of forging names which gave him the opportunity of realising a sum of money sufficient to satisfy his then immediate wants. He explained to me (and I believed him, and I believe everybody else did, for he had a most estimable character) that his intention was not to steal the money absolutely, but to save and repay the debt, but he was overtaken before he had the opportunity of doing it. Well, that is forgery. It places the Judge in a very painful position to know what punishment to award to a man of that sort; but under the circumstances I met the difficulty as best I could, and gave him that amount of punishment which I thought was lenient under the circumstances, as it ought to be; but that is the mischief. That, to my mind, is a strong instance of the misery which is brought about by these extortionate money-lenders."

The Chairman said—

> "In the case you have mentioned this young man first went to the money-lender?
>
> "The learned Judge: He innocently, and with a view of making his little home comfortable for his wife, a little exceeded his income.
>
> "He went to the money-lender; then he took to betting. Would you say that it was the case that men take to betting and resort

to the money-lender's office to pay the bets?—I think very often.

"That was Sir George Lewis's evidence?—That is my opinion.

"So [says the Chairman] it encourages gambling and leads to crime?—It does."

All I can say is that I am surprised that no member of the Committee was bold enough to tell the learned Judge, with the utmost deference, that the *Strand Magazine* was a better vehicle for telling a story of that sort than a Blue-book published at the expense of the country. We will come now to the Bill itself. I will say at once that I have two objections to this measure; it strikes a blow at those pillars of every rational system of modern jurisprudence—first, the stability of contracts, and secondly, the necessity for preserving accurately what you mean by strict legal proof. Consider the effect of this Bill. Clause 1 says—

"Where proceedings are taken in any court by a money-lender for the recovery of any money lent after the passing of this Act, or the enforcement of any agreement or security made or taken after the passing of this Act, in respect of money lent either before or after the passing of this Act, and the court has reason to believe that the interest charged in respect of the sum actually lent exceeds the rate of interest mentioned in the schedule to this Act, or that the amounts charged for expenses, inquiries, fines, bonus, premium, renewals, or any other charges, are excessive, and that, in either case, the transaction is harsh and unconscionable, the court may re-open the transaction, and take an account between the money-lender and the person sued, and may, notwithstanding any statement or settlement of account or any agreement purporting to close previous dealings and create a new obligation, re-open any account already taken between them, and relieve the person sued from payment of any sum in excess of the sum adjudged by the court to be fairly due in respect of such principal, interest and charges as the court, having regard to the risk and all the circumstances, may adjudge to be reasonable; and if any such excess has been paid, or allowed in account, by the debtor, may order the creditor to repay it; and may set aside, either wholly or in part, or revise, or alter, any security given or agreement made in respect of money lent by the money-lender, and if the money-lender has parted with the security may order him to indemnify the borrower or other person sued."

I have no desire to speak otherwise than most respectfully of all the Judges in the land, but it is quite impossible not to consider this question of judicial discretion and to consider what effect we ought to give to the very powerful observations of Mr. Justice Mathew before this Committee itself. There are seventy-nine gentlemen—twenty-three High Court Judges and fifty-six County Court Judges—who will have this discretion of upsetting any contract whatsoever if the interest is more than 15 per cent. per annum, and if in their opinion there is reason to believe that the bargain is harsh and unconscionable. I know that, as a great French critic said it is very difficult to speak of chastity chastely, so it is difficult to speak of discretion discreetly, and it is not less difficult if the discretion of which you speak is that peculiar kind called "judicial." Everybody knows that so long as a judge is confined to his proper duty—namely, the ascertainment of the law as it is at the moment, or the proper weight and effect to be given to the evidence which has been submitted to him and to the ordinary test of cross-examination, so powerful are the traditions of a lifetime, so strong are the habits of legal training, that, enormous as is the difference between one Judge and another in capacity, learning, astuteness, and acumen, yet nevertheless the difference between the decisions of various judges will be comparatively small. But the moment you say to a Judge, "It is for you, independently of evidence, independently of strict proof, but exercising your own fancies and idiosyncrasies, to say practically what is a proper rate of interest for a man in Bradford or Leeds to charge another man for the loan of £4," the moment you say that, you throw open the door to every kind and variety of personal opinion in the Judges themselves. I am absolutely certain that were this Bill to become law, and were three money-lenders to be pursuing what you are pleased to call their remedies in three Courts of the Queen's Bench Division, whether they got 5 per cent., 15 per cent., or the percentage provided in their agreement would depend entirely upon the personal idiosyncrasy of the particular Judge who might happen to come into that particular Court at half-past ten or eleven o'clock in the morning. Many Judges have been heard to say in the County Courts that they will never give more than 5 per cent. interest to a money-lender; they think it is wrong to do so: they are animated by that spirit of hatred of the whole class of money-lenders which breathes through the spirited preamble which I ventured to read to the House. Other Judges are inclined to hold men strictly to their contracts, and they say that a man ought to pay what his contract says he should pay, unless he can prove fraud or deception, or something of that kind. This question of judicial discretion is one of the utmost importance. I quite agree with what was said by Lord Penzance on a celebrated occasion; I will not quote the whole of his remarks, but he wound up by saying, "Speaking generally, when discretion begins, the proper administration of the law, as such, comes to an end." I venture to say that that is a sound and incontrovertible proposition. We do not want seventy-nine gentlemen to be constituted censors of what is a fair bargain between two parties. We want our Judges to be confined to considering whether it is proved to their satisfaction that a transaction is harsh and unconscionable. I do not particularly object to the phrase "harsh and unconscionable"; but in the Courts of Equity from time immemorial proof has been required, and that does not depend upon the whim or fancy of any individual Judge. During the last few months I have done my best to ascertain whether there is not likely to be inflicted upon the poor of this country a very great hardship if this Bill is passed, and I have come to the conclusion that that is so. In the north of England, and I dare say in other parts where there are poor men—it may be a hawker, who wishes to get a stock for his wallet or his bag to go to a fair or a race-meeting where he is likely to get a good return for his money—there are countless transactions where a man wants a loan of £4 or £5. Who is going to let him have it? Will the members of this Committee lend every poor man who wants it £5? Not at all; it would not fall within the scope of their avocations. But the business is carried on in a perfectly legitimate fashion. The poor man who wants a loan goes to the lender, carrying with him his credentials. They are not gilt-edged securities. Hon. Members when they want to borrow £50,000 or £60,000 or a smaller sum for their election expenses go to their bankers with gilt-edged securities or the nearest approach they have thereto, but such a man as I am referring to takes his rent-book to show that at least he is not in arrear with his rent, while inquiries show that he is not a defaulter in the County Court, and if he bears an ordinarily good character he obtains his small loan without security and without sureties. And what else does he obtain? He obtains what is to him the inestimable privilege of repaying the money in driblets. That is of the very essence of poverty. Notwithstanding all the statements of this excited Committee, I believe it is a very great service to a great number of poor men all over the country to be able to obtain, if their characters are anything like reasonable, these small loans. One half of the world does not know how the other half lives, and it will be an act of cruelty to a great number of poor people in this country if you place such an obstacle as this in the way of their obtaining such loans. Look at the scale in this Bill. The scale allowed for £50 for a month is 12s. 6d. Is it unreasonable if a man charges 15s. for the loan of £50 for a month? I do not think many men in this House would do it. In fact, this business cannot be carried on without very considerable office expenditure, so as to be able to ascertain particulars of the character of the would-be borrower, and you must in a great many instances make bad debts. People usually look upon this matter as if each transaction was absolutely isolated, and that the lender got 50 per cent., or whatever it is, clear. How unreasonable! You have to consider the average of the transactions throughout the year. I do not believe it will be found in any well-conducted loan society or company of this kind, if a proper inquiry is made, that the average rate of interest is more than 10 per cent. or 12 per cent. on the whole capital involved. I therefore say that by inserting in this Bill the provision that a County Court Judge or a Judge of the High Court should be at liberty to set aside every solemn contract, however long it may have been in operation or whatever cash payments have been made under it, whenever the interest is more than 15 per cent. per annum, you are practically saying that in the opinion of this House 15 per cent. is enough to charge for every transaction of this sort. I have no hesitation in saying that any Judge who has an aversion to money-lenders, who is animated by something of the spirit of the hon. Member who moved the Second Reading of this Bill, will consider himself at liberty, whenever the interest is more than this 15 per cent., to decide that he has reason to believe that the transaction is harsh and unconscionable, and to act in any way his discretion may suggest to him. I say that 15 per cent. on a small loan, repaid in driblets extending over many months, is an absurdly small sum. Look at pawnbrokers. A pawnbroker gets your watch or something which is more than ample security, and the law allows him to charge 25 per cent. But you say that in the case of a poor man who obtains a loan without any security, the interest is to be calculated at so much per annum instead of per week (because the repayments are so much per week), and I contend that 15 per cent. is an absurdly small and unreasonable charge to be made for the loan. I must apologise to the House for detaining it at such length, but I really do want this to be considered as a serious question. I believe that by passing this Bill you will inflict a very grave hardship on the very people whose condition you want to make better. Their lot is hard enough now, heaven knows. The poor man has to pay heavily for everything. He has to pay heavily for his house and for his food, and now you are going to make him pay more heavily for his money when he has to borrow, because, by putting difficulties in the way of such transactions, you will very likely throw him into the hands of the rogues and impostors. As Jeremy Bentham said years ago, "If a man cannot borrow he will sell," and there is nothing in your precious law to prevent a man realising at a miserable sacrifice the small belongings of his house. He may sell for next to nothing things which cost him a great deal, but he must not borrow. There is supposed to be something peculiarly sanctified about a contract of borrowing, but there is nothing of the kind. A contract of selling should be invested with exactly the same sanctity if there is any—but it is not. You will not let a man borrow, you condemn him to sell, and that is a very grave and serious disaster. I ask the House most carefully to consider whether it is worth while, just because there are a few rogues and impostors in the country, with whom I honestly believe the present law is quite strong enough to deal, to inflict, through this Bill, a grave injury upon the very poor. Isaac Gordon has gone to his account, but before he went a court of this country discharged a man from his obligation because he did not know he was dealing with Isaac Gordon. I confess I thought it was strong law, but it was the law of Lord Justice Vaughan Williams, Lord Justice Rigby, and Lord Justice Smith, and, as Isaac Gordon is not in a position to carry the case to the House of Lords, I expect the law of England it will always remain. Do not think so meanly of the law of your country as to suppose that this Bill is necessary. It is nothing of the kind, and I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I think the House has no reason to complain that the task of moving the rejection of this Bill fell into the hands of the hon. and learned Member opposite, who has delighted us with the skill and vigour with which he has spoken. The first thing I would say with regard to the Bill is that the House ought not to suppose that it deals merely with the case of a few money-lenders. The great objection to it is that it runs counter to the principles which have governed the commercial legislation of this country during the century. Our commercial legislation has been entirely in favour of freedom and of removing all shackles from industry and commerce. The present Bill goes entirely in the opposite direction. It is important to look at its object. The hon. Gentleman who introduced it was the Chairman of the Committee on whose Report the Bill is founded. He took credit to himself in his speech to-night that he had always followed the advice of Polonius—"Neither a borrower nor a lender be." I cannot help thinking that that shows the weakness of his present position in taking charge of a Bill of this kind. It would be much better if the Government had placed it in the hands of some hon. Member who was familiar with commercial affairs and had been in the habit of dealing with money all his life. The Bill is of a sentimental character, and such as we are accustomed to see brought forward on Wednesday afternoons. It is a curious circumstance that the member of the Government who is generally in charge of such measures on Wednesday is the hon. Gentleman himself. I suppose other members of the Government do not care to take them in hand. At all events, they studiously absent themselves from the House on such occasions.

This is a fair specimen of the kind of legislation to which we are accustomed on Wednesday afternoons, and perhaps that is the reason why it has been entrusted to the hon. Member. I have seen a great many gentlemen connected with the money-lending business, and I was perfectly astonished to find what a large body of respectable people they are. Their frequent complaint to me was that they had not had a fair hearing before the Money-lending Committee. One can understand that was so from the admission made by the hon. Member to-night. He said it did not come within the terms of reference to the Committee to hear all the people who wished to be heard in defence of money-lenders. The Committee heard a great deal of evidence about some very notorious money-lenders, and my chief objection to this Bill is that it is a thoroughly vindictive Bill, founded on the misdeeds of one particular individual. It is impossible to choose any worse principle as a guide in initiating legislation than to take some singular case of oppression or wrong and found a general Bill upon it. We had the case of the notorious Isaac Gordon, which was dwelt upon with some reiteration in the Committee, and so much prejudice was raised throughout the country by the way the Committee dealt with that man that I venture to say that any money-lender at the present time would have less chance of justice at the hands of a British jury than he would have had in the time of the Plantagenets. A British jury does not allow any borrower to be ill-treated by the person from whom he has borrowed money; on the contrary, a jury is likely to treat the lender with the greatest severity. It is said that this Bill is founded on principles well known to the law, and that pawnbrokers, for instance, have their rates of interest limited; but, as my hon. and learned friend opposite has pointed out, there is all the difference in the world between a pawnbroker and a money-lender. A pawnbroker lends on certain definite security, a certain fixed amount. The security is brought to him generally in the form of articles, of which the borrower is sorely in need, and the Legislature naturally deals with tenderness with such matters. But the money-lender lends money on a promissory note, as a rule, and gets no security. He lends on the credit and good faith of the borrower, and he is therefore entitled to charge a much greater rate of interest than a pawnbroker, who lends on a definite security. Great complaint is made as to the high rate of interest charged by the money-lender, but in dealing with transactions of this kind we should not take a few individual examples only; we should survey a wide field, and see what interest is charged over all the transactions in which money-lenders are engaged. I have seen the books of a money-lending firm which has a very large business in the country, amounting to £150,000 or £200,000 a year, all lent in small sums. I have seen from these books that the average rate of profit made by the firm does not exceed from 16 per cent. to 18 per cent. per annum. The firm has very large expenses and runs great risks, and it frequently happens that the borrower cheats the firm instead of the firm cheating the borrower. Does it do any harm to the country that money should be lent in this way? On the contrary, it is of the greatest benefit indeed to vast multitudes of the people who are greatly in need from time to time of money to carry on their business. A very large proportion of the money lent by money-lenders is lent to tradesmen in a small way of business and to professional men. It very often happens that a man of that class gets into difficulties in which his credit is at stake, and he would be willing to pay not 10 per cent. nor 20 per cent. but 100 per cent. for money to tide him over his difficulties, and to save his good name, and to allow him to carry on business again in a fair way. That happens very frequently. No doubt many hon. Members who have never wanted a guinea in their lives do not understand the position of these poor people, but every man who is engaged in business, and who has had ups and downs in his life, and has had to fight his way in the world, must know that over and over again there is no rate of interest which he would not pay for money to keep his head above water. This is done every day not only by money-lenders but by institutions in the City of London which lend money at a usurious rate of interest. I have in my recollection a case which happened a few years ago in which persons introducing a valuable invention were pressed to such an extent that they had to pledge all the credit of their directors, and were then at their wits' ends to get money. They borrowed money at a usurious rate of interest which removed their difficulties, and at the present time the concern is one of the most prosperous in the City of London; the directors are very wealthy men, and the shareholders are now reaping the benefit of the money borrowed at that time. If that money had not been forthcoming the invention itself would have been lost to the world and the directors would have been plunged into the Bankruptcy Court. That is an example of the good that is done by lending money in this way. I daresay there are some hon. Members in this House who, though they have never borrowed money for their own business, know what it is to borrow money for little speculations on the Stock Exchange. I ask them if they have not often paid a much higher rate of interest than is mentioned in the schedule in order to carry their speculations over from one settlement to another? It is perfectly useless to attempt by Act of Parliament to limit the interest that should be paid on loans of this kind. It is said that the rate of interest is not fixed by this Bill, but under the first clause it is possible for any Judge in any Court in the land to reopen any money-lending transaction and fix any rate of interest he likes. He is not even bound by the rate of interest mentioned in the schedule. If he thinks the bargain is not just, he may reopen it, and absolute discretion is left to him to fix any rate of interest he thinks sufficient payment for the money that has been borrowed. The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite has pointed out the incalculable mischief which will be produced if such an absolute discretion is left to every Judge in every Court in the land. I am sure many Judges on the Bench are men of the highest character and men to whom I should gladly leave the decision of any matter of this kind, but many of them would shrink from the responsibility which the hon. Gentleman without any hesitation wants to give them. So far, objection has been taken to the first clause in the Bill. There are many other clauses about registration, etc., which are good, and money-lenders as a body do not object to them. But this Bill proceeds on the principle laid down for making an admirable cucumber salad. You cut the cucumber, delicately mix the oil and vinegar, and then when complete you throw it out of the window. In this Bill you are taking most admirable precautions to ensure that the money-lending business should be carried on respectably, and then in the first clause you say that the business is not to be carried on at all. No doubt if this Bill passes it will be a serious blow to the freedom with which money is now lent throughout the country—money which is absolutely needed in many instances, and without which it will be very difficult for many small people to carry on business. That is the main objection which we take to this Bill. I second the motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite with the greatest pleasure, because I think the Bill is one which is bound to fail in its intended effect, and one which is mischievous and reactionary in its design.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. WARR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The hon. Gentleman has given us as an illustration a case where an invention was saved by borrowing money at a very high rate of interest. I care not if in such a case the rate was 50 per cent. or 75 per cent. This Bill would not in any way interfere with a transaction of that kind. Take the case of a ship in a foreign port. The owner has no money. He tries to get it from the ordinary sources, but does not succeed. He goes to a money-lender and borrows money at 20 per cent. or 30 per cent. He then brings the ship home and handles the freight and pays his disbursements. There would be no relief for him from that bargain under this Bill, because it only applies to cases in which a court of law finds that the rate of interest was excessive and also that the bargain was harsh and unconscionable. In the two cases I have mentioned there would be no evidence of anything harsh or unconscionable. The whole transaction would be perfectly understood and would be entirely above board. The two contracting parties would have been equally free agents. On the other hand, supposing the loan is made to a Bank of England clerk, or to a clergyman, or to a Government official, and that, relying on the ruin that publicity would bring, the money-lender if the instalment is not paid to the day and to the very hour makes the application for renewal of the loan the occasion first of getting an admission of his account for principal, interest, and charges, and then taking a new promissory note for what is due upon the account so stated, including fines and charges and interest at an inconsiderable rate, with a huge rate of interest for the further advances. I think it is not improbable, under such circumstances, the lender having relied on the ruin which would be involved by publicity, that the unfortunate borrower might look for some relief under this Bill. It is not so much to the initial transaction as to the subsequent transactions that the Bill would apply. Can anyone say that under such circumstances the bargain is between two free agents? The lender is free, the borrower has a pistol at his head. Unless he agrees to the terms, whatever they are, he must be a ruined man. This Bill will enable poor people to get justice done. No one who sat in the Committee, as I had the honour of doing, and heard the evidence can have the least doubt that some legislation of this kind is needed. It is very significant that the first reference to this Committee—which was established on the initiation of my hon. friend the Member for Chester, to whom we owe so much in the matter—was confined to an inquiry into the evils of money-lending between the poorer classes and professional moneylenders. It will be felt that it is more important that the poor should be relieved from oppression than that the law should aid persons who have less excuse or no excuse for finding themselves in the hands of money-lenders, although it was subsequently extended to a general inquiry. My hon. and learned friend the Member for Fife says that the law as it stands affords a sufficient remedy. If so, I should like to know why it is that the Courts are not resorted to in such cases. I do not dispute the fact that relief can be granted under the equitable jurisdiction of the Courts against harsh and unconscionable bargains, but I think it will be admitted, and that the hon. and learned Member for West Fife will admit, that the cases are rare in which relief has been extended except to heirs, expectants, and reversioners. The money-lenders of the class who bring this business into disrepute—I am quite willing to believe that there are money-lenders who conduct their business honestly—know far too well how to make any relief on the part of the borrower as the law now stands an absolute impossibility. I venture to doubt whether, apart from cases in which heirs and reversioners have been concerned, there have been a dozen cases reported in the authorised reports in which relief has been given during the last thirty years. No doubt most of these cases come before County Courts; but according to Judge Owen, who gave valuable evidence before the Committee, the County Courts have no power to set aside or cancel any agreements except agreements of sale. I venture to think that no one reading the valuable evidence of Mr. Justice Mathew and Sir George Lewis can maintain that it is in the power of the Courts to give the relief that ought to be given in cases of this kind. The money-lender makes it absolutely impossible for the debtor to make out a case for relief as the law now stands. Nothing is more significant than the dread the money-lenders themselves feel of legislation on the lines of this Bill. That is the best proof of the need of legislation. It may be suggested that we have the security of the criminal law. The hon. and learned Member for West Fife did not refer to that remedy, but in criminal prosecutions there is very great difficulty, because practically a course of dealing with intent to defraud must be proved, and it is obvious that witnesses would be adverse to coming forward to state their personal experience. What we require is power to enable the courts to reopen money-lending transactions if they are unjust, and to reopen them notwithstanding any settlement of account, and to force the money-lender to repay any amount unfairly taken by him. That is the effect of this Bill. I believe this Bill will not affect any honest dealing. If there were no definition of a money-lender in the Bill, and if it were to apply to every transaction, I do not believe that the honest trader would have anything to fear from its operation. The Committee thought that Mr. Justice Mathew was right when he said that there should be no definition of a money-lender in the Bill, as there is not the slightest danger of its interfering with any legitimate business. I never heard that any objection had been raised by any banker to the Committee's proposals. Bankers know very well that there would not be the slightest danger of interference with any legitimate business under proposals such as are embodied in the clause giving discretion to the Courts. The hon. and learned Member for West Fife seems to think that it is monstrous to confer discretion upon Judges to review agreements which have been made. In the first place, the power of the Courts will rarely be invoked unless the interest exceeds the rate of interest in the Bill. Why should there be any doubt as to the capacity of the Judges to exercise their discretion? I myself can remember the time when bonds were constantly given upon the security of ships in foreign ports. They are very rare now because the cable has made it quite easy to pass money at almost a moment's notice. The rate of interest on bonds of that kind was oftentimes very high, and the Courts always claimed the right to reopen the agreement and to cut down the rate of interest if in their discretion it was too high. I myself was acquainted with a case between a shipowner and a lender, which was referred by agreement to a Judge of the High Court, and the Judge awarded interest at the rate of 20 per cent. That may seem excessive, but, taking into account all the circumstances, the Judge considered it was fair. I see no reason to fear that any more difficulty will arise out of the discretion of the Judge as to what is reasonable, than presents itself when juries are asked every day in the week to take into account all the circumstances of the case, and say what was a reasonable amount to award. It would be better upon strict principle to leave the amount to be fixed by the juries, but money-lenders might reasonably think that they would not get even-handed justice from them. Therefore to leave it in the discretion of the Judge is in the interest of the money-lenders. I have no doubt that this Bill will do something to prevent dishonest money-lending. I do not think it will be found to stand in the way of any honest transaction. If it to any extent prevents dishonest money-lending, if, as was predicted by money-lenders, it makes their business as some of them have carried it on useless and unprofitable, then this Bill will not have been passed in vain.

Mr. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): Really when I read this Bill I feel quite confused about the days of the week, and cannot say whether this is a Thursday, or a Wednesday, when Private Members' Bills are introduced. Private Members, with the best possible intention in the world, on that day introduce Bills likely to produce the worst possible results. I cannot help thinking that the Government do not intend to persist with this Bill, and that it is only "out for an airing," and that it is not intended to "gallop or go" after the punishing disclosures of the hon. and learned Member for West Fife. The hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Liverpool pointed out to us some cases which the Bill would affect; but I want to know what cases it will affect, which it ought to affect, which are not already affected by the law as it now stands? The hon. Member gave us one instance. He spoke of a Bank of England clerk. I suppose Bank of England clerks are not allowed to borrow money, under the penalty of dismissal, and he referred to one case of such a clerk borrowing money, and somehow or other he seems to think that this Bill would have protected that clerk. I do not see it. He says that the plan of the money-lender is to get exorbitant rates of interest from the clerk under the threats of exposure, but certainly that money-lender could, under the present law, be convicted of obtaining money by threats—whether in the form of interest or cash-down payments. But be that as it may, you will not be able to relieve the clerk from exposure under this Bill. It is said that only the dishonest money-lender will be affected by the Bill. I cannot see that at all. I had a letter from a money-lender, whom I believe to be a perfectly honest man, in my constituency, who tells me that he does a very large business in lending money to working men from week to week, and that his rate of interest is from 20 to 25 per cent. He asks me to inspect his books, which shows that he only makes a decent livelihood and no more. Nothing can be more retrograde than to speak of one rate of interest as just under all conditions. It all depends on the security. When a man comes to me and deposits certain securities I may advance him money at 7 per cent., but is 20 per cent. too much to charge on a note of hand?

In the City such business as lending on note of hand would not be done; it would be looked upon as far too dangerous. The hon. Member spoke of the rate of interest of 20 or 25 per cent. as nett. It is nothing of the kind. It is saddled with all the expenses of inquiry and with bad debts. Do not let anyone run away with the idea that the moneylenders are all rogues and the borrowers all honest men. My experience leads me to the opposite conclusion. No protection or assistance is given to money-lenders when they are cheated, as has been shown already. There is no necessity for protecting the borrower; even a black-mailing Bill would not protect him from that. But let us take another point. A man's business must be that of money-lending if he is to come within the compass of the Bill; but what about the tailors? How are those young men, who run into debt with their tailors, to be protected from extortion; and, if not, why not? Does anyone suppose that money-lenders would not start tailoring or other similar businesses with the view of keeping their money-lending transactions outside this Bill? Of course not. As to the power of revising contracts, the objection is not that any particular judge is not likely to do his duty, but that each would be free to develop his idiosyncrasies, and you might have cases of gross injustice. One case might be dealt with from one point of view one month, and another from another point of view next week. Already divergencies in criminal cases are sufficiently large according to the different idiosyncrasies of the different judges. One Judge will send a man to fourteen days imprisonment for half killing his wife, and another Judge would send a wretch to a year's imprisonment for a petty larceny. One Judge, starting with the presumption that 5 per cent. is a proper rate of interest, whatever the circumstances of the loan may be, would at once decide that 25 per cent. is in itself evidence that that rate of interest is "harsh and unconscionable." We have already seen cases in which a Judge said that 5 per cent. is a sufficient rate of interest in any circumstances, and that that is the maximum rate of interest which ought to be charged. Now that is a question of opinion, and it is too risky to give such power to any individual, whether he is a Judge or a Member on the front bench. Then, the Judges are not to be guided by any law at all, and they are not even obliged to take evidence. They can, according to this Bill, upset contracts which have been entered into by two grown-up men, each of them possibly trying to cheat the other—if that is not equal terms I do not know what is. They know every circumstance of the case that is material to be known—not to both of them, but to the borrower. If anything is kept back from him that ought to be disclosed the Court, under the present law, will set aside the contract on the ground of fraud. When these two men meet they make a bargain agreeable to both of them. Why does the borrower take the money? Because, in his deliberate judgment, he considers it more to his interest than to go without it. You let him make the bargain, but are you going to help him to cheat the money-lender? Can anything be more unjust? I cannot conceive it. Most of these money-lenders are honest traders, and the effect will be that these men will have to calculate the risk of having their rates reduced, and they will inevitably "take it out of" other men who will not come into court. You cannot fight against natural laws; and if you read Adam Smith, Ricardo, Bentham, you will find that if you pass this Bill into law, you are knocking against these natural laws, and that you had better have left the subject alone.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I can say that three or four years ago the speech of the hon. and learned Member for West Fife would have expressed correctly the opinion of the whole of the Committee which sat on this inquiry. But what did we find when we began to take evidence? We found that the money-lending business was a sore eating into the very life of the working classes of the country, leading to poverty, to increase of the rates, and to habits of drunkenness and betting. We also found that the rich people in this country who had extravagant relations and who were prepared to find a fair and reasonable amount of interest when these relations got into the hands of the money-lenders, could make advantageous terms with the money-lenders, who were willing to take 5 per cent. interest, no matter how unconscionable the original contract had been. Certain solicitors had that power with the money-lending fraternity. But the poor man or woman had no protection from paying from 60 to 300 or 400 per cent. for their advances. What was the trap set for these poor people? In the local newspapers in every town in the country, and in some in London, there was sandwiched between advertisements about some excellent building society, with an excellent board of directors whom everybody knew, another advertisement that some Union Bank had £250,000 to lend on note of hand. Of course that was not the Union Bank which we know is one of the finest banks in the country. The poor people were caught by that plausible advertisement, and once in the hands of these money-lenders they were bled to death, and their furniture and home sold up. After sitting for two years and hearing all that evidence, the Committee were unanimous in recommending what is the principle of this Bill. Of course the Bill can be improved. The object of the Bill is, in the first place, to let a man know exactly with whom he is dealing — that he is not dealing with a Union Bank, or a Provincial Union Bank, but at the bottom with a Mr. Isaac Gordon. We must have these money-lending gentlemen registered. We are agreed on that. Now there comes a very serious question. My hon. friend is against giving the Judges the right or privilege to say what is an unconscionable bargain or a fair bargain between man and man, taking into consideration all the circumstances of the case. We do that already. In a case of bigamy the judges have the power to say whether a man should go to prison for one day or for ten years. Has that power ever been abused? On the same principle, we wish to give the Judges power to say what is a proper and fair rate of interest. We had cases before us of family after family being ruined completely by getting into the hands of these money-lenders. An extraordinary case went to the Court of Appeal the other day, and the judgment was in favour of the man who borrowed the money from Mr. Gordon because he had been trading under somebody else's name. But what could a poor man have done in such a case? In fact, we would not have had that decision in the Court of Appeal but for the evidence which had been produced before the Committee. I hope that the Government, because some of their friends are wavering on this question, and some of our friends on this side of the House have not the knowledge that we have who sat two years on that Committee, will not be dismayed or down-hearted, but that they will put their back into this great social reform and determine to carry it through this session. If they do that, they will save a great many families, whom it is their duty and that of the House of Commons to protect, from the snares of the money-lenders.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): Although I cannot regard this Bill with the unqualified condemnation lavished upon it by the hon. and learned Member for West Fife, I find very great difficulty in supporting it as it stands. The Bill is very curiously framed. Practically the serious part of it deals with two things—the transactions of the money-lender and the regulation of the trade. Of the latter part I have very little to complain. If we can locate the money-lender, register him, and regulate him so much the better. But the Bill creates a new kind of offence—a misdemeanour punishable by two years imprisonment or a fine not exceeding £500. One of the provisions is rather startling. The offence is that—

> "Any money-lender, or manager, or agent, or clerk of a money-lender who, by any false or misleading statement, attempts to induce any person to borrow money, or agree to terms on which money is to be borrowed," etc.

Now, there is no suggestion that the person who has been induced to borrow the money has been injured by the transaction. The offence is merely a deceptive statement, and it suggests to me a new and satisfactory way of paying old debts. If a man borrows money and is unwilling to pay when the lender demands it, he may say, "There is a misleading statement in the correspondence between us prior to the loan. I do not propose to repay the money, but I propose to indict you for misdemeanour." That clause requires very careful reconsideration. Then the whole efficacy of the Bill turns upon the definition of a money-lender. But what is a money-lender? We are told that a money-lender is a person who lends money, which is fairly obvious, and further that he is not a pawnbroker, a friendly society, a body corporate, an insurance company, or a banker. I should be surprised if such astute persons as money-lenders have proved themselves to be do not evade this somewhat precarious definition. The Bill begins with a preamble of an unusual character. It is like the preamble to the Statute of Uses, which Lord Bacon called a persuading and inducing preamble. I cannot help thinking that it would have been much better if, instead of going to old statutes for his preamble, the draughtsman had gone to the old cookery books, and had started with the phrase, "First catch your money - lender." The first thing we have to consider is whether there is a grievance, and, if so, how it is to be remedied. I must confess that the great bulk of the evidence taken before the Committee does not suggest to me a grievance requiring a drastic remedy. There are incidents brought up which affect people's minds and which give notoriety to the work of the Committee, but which do not call for interference. If I recollect rightly there was the case of a young man who escaped from a home for inebriates and fell into the clutches of a money-lender, and died whilst engaged in evading the demands of that money-lender. But the Chancery Division would have been amply capable of dealing with difficulties of that sort. Then there was the mysterious adventure of a lady who communicated a forged note to a money lender. This would be dealt with by the ordinary process of criminal law. But then, apart from the stories told to the Committee, which might be interesting for the purposes of passing this Bill, there does appear to be a mass of evidence which suggests that there are cases of oppression of the poor through the agency of money-lenders which require to be dealt with in some way or other. But if a grievance exists there is the question of how far this Bill proposes to deal with it. In the Committee there were three remedies suggested: first, the limitation of the rate of interest, making it illegal to recover more than 10 per cent.; the power of reopening a transaction where the Court had reason to believe that an unfair advantage had been taken by one of the parties; and the registration of securities given to money-lenders. A promissory note given to a money-lender was to be made distinct from one given in an ordinary business transaction. Registration of securities appeared in the Bill of last year, but doubtless for good reason has disappeared from this. This Bill applies in a half-hearted way two out of the three suggested remedies—an extension of the power of reopening a transaction and a mild suggestion of a usury law. I agree with Mr. Justice Mathew that the great value of any assistance which we could give to the poor men who are oppressed in transactions of this kind consists in its rapidity and in its cheapness. But if the House looks at the remedy offered in the Bill it is neither simple nor clear. In the first place, a man must prove that he was dealing with a money-lender, that the percentage charged for the loan was a certain percentage in the schedule, and he must induce the Judge to form a general impression that the transaction was unconscionable, and after this the Judge would re-open the transaction. That does not seem to me to be a very prompt or valuable assistance to a poor man in the clutches of a money-lender. I think it would be as well to consider how this matter is dealt with elsewhere. By the Indian Contract Act as amended last year Judges in India are given power to re-open transactions in all cases where a contract was made with a person whose fitness to enter into it might be questioned by reason of age, illness, or mental or bodily distress. That is a very wide power to give, no doubt. The German Civil Code provides that where one man takes advantage of another who is in necessitous circumstances, who is ignorant, or had shown insufficient experience or care, so that the parties were on unequal terms, the transaction is to be null and void; and by the Penal Code for such exploitation such a person is liable to severe penalties. These remedies are at any rate clear and comprehensive, but the remedy offered by this Bill is a mild extension of an equitable doctrine, hampered with an insufficient definition of money-lender, and haunted by the uneasy ghost of the usury laws. If this measure is to be pursued, if the House acknowledges that there is a grievance, that grievance ought to be dealt with in a masterful way. Either we ought to offer a substantial remedy or do what is possibly the best thing to do in the circumstances—namely, leave the grievance alone.

MR. STEADMAN (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): It was not my intention to intervene in this debate, and I should not have done so but for the concluding remark of the hon. Member for West Fife. At the conclusion of his speech he said that this Bill would confer a great hardship on the working classes of this country. It will do nothing of the sort. The working classes are not in the habit of looking up the advertisements in the newspapers to see where they can secure a loan, and the money-lender of the type this Bill attacks is not of that class who would make a working man a loan. First of all, very good security is required, which working men are not likely to have, besides which, working men have their own way of dealing with the matter. In London there are hundreds of loan clubs managed by working men themselves. A man for a £1 share pays 6d. a week to the society, and if he wants a loan he has only to get one of his mates to stand security for him, and he can borrow his £2 or £3 and pay it back at so much a week. Many men belong to these clubs for the purpose of borrowing a few pounds in the summer to take their families to the seaside. In my constituency has also been formed a co-operative bank, and the object of the formation of this bank is to enable the very man that the hon. Member for West Fife has been speaking of to borrow £3 or £4 when he was hard pressed without going to these extortionate money-lenders. The right hon. Member for Fife, has not, perhaps, had any experience of loan clubs, but I may say that the money of these loan clubs is shared between the members at Christmas, when it comes in very handy. [Laughter.] Hon. Members laugh, but I speak from a practical and not a theoretical point of view, and if any hon. Member here was the son of a father who had been out of work for a few weeks before Christmas, and had nothing in his pocket, he would be very glad to receive in this way a few shillings to put upon his table. Pawnbrokers have been referred to, and to the working man they are sometimes a very useful class; for the working man, though poor, is proud, and rather than go to his friends will pawn what little jewellery he possesses, say, a watch or a chain, and when that pledge is redeemed the pawnbroker is bound to return it in as good a condition as he received it. I am glad on this occasion I am able to support the Government. It has been stated that the Bill will enable the borrower to cheat the money-lender, but I deny that that will be the case. The Bill does not in any way affect the honest man. Perhaps the Member for West Fife will not object to lending a hand to protect the working classes from unscrupulous landlords, as he takes so much interest in them as appears by his speech. I hope the Government will stick to their Bill, which will inflict no hardship upon working men.

*MR. GEDGE (Walsall) said the hon. Member for Stepney had told the House that so far from creating a hardship the passing of this Bill would confer a boon upon the working man; and the boon conferred was that it would not affect the working man at all. He wished it would confer the same boon upon other people. Both reason and experience were against any attempt to interfere in free contracts between persons of ripe years, and he believed that any interference such as was contemplated by the Bill before the House was bound in the long run to injure not the money-lender but the man who borrows the money. The Bill proposed to allow a particular interest in particular cases, but in arriving at the interest to be allowed the Judge must consider the circumstances of the transaction and the value of money at the time the transaction was entered into. For instance, when the Bank rate was 10 per cent. then 25 per cent. might be a fair rate of interest to be allowed, but if the Bank rate was 2 per cent. it would be quite a different matter. A rate to be usurious must be either more than the law permits or more than is usual. This may be so, but what is meant by usual ? One rate may be fair when the Bank rate is low, the borrower a substantial man, and the security good, but when dealing with a man who could give no security whatever, and has no character to lose, they must put out of consideration all such things as these, and endeavour to fix what the rate should be in the case of a man who could offer no security whatever, and that would be found an extremely difficult task. It was quite certain that the rate paid for the use of anything, even of money, as in everything else, depended mainly upon the law of supply and demand. If the supply of money was ample the rate went down; if it was short the rate went up. By making a stringent law they would make it more difficult for the lender to lend money, and therefore it would be more difficult to borrow it. The Bill was opposed to every principle of political economy, and moreover it was proposed to enact that the poor man might be charged 25 per cent. interest, and the rich man only 15 per cent. The man who was determined to have money would have it at all hazards, as a drunkard would have drink, and having no security he would be compelled to pay a high rate of interest. This was a mere departmental Bill, and its introduction was due to the fact that we have no Prime Minister—Lord Salisbury, as a Foreign Minister, was beyond all praise, but his duties and anxieties as Foreign Secretary precluded him from paying attention to the sentimental nonsense of his colleagues, or he would have put his foot down on such a Bill as this. Although at one time he had hoped that he would be able to vote for the Second Reading, and that Clause 1 would be struck out in Committee, he felt now that he could not do so, having regard to the imminent approach of the end of the session, and to the little probability that the Bill would find its way through Committee. Those who voted for the Second Reading would be supposed to have accepted the principle of the Bill. It was said that the Bill is in favour of the poor. Poor people borrow small sums and rich people large sums; the poor might be charged 25 per cent. per annum, but if a man borrowed more than £10 he might be charged 15 per cent. The poorer the man the higher the rate of interest to be charged. Why should a law not be made to interfere with bargains made between man and man for the temporary use and return afterwards in good condition, not of money, but of a house? It was of a great deal more importance that a man should be housed respectably and decently. Why is a man allowed to build houses and get the highest rent he can for them? If the principle of this Bill were applied to matters of that kind it would only have the effect of preventing houses being built. He had read nearly all the evidence which was given before the Committee, and all he could say was that in coming to their decision their hearts must have had more power over the result than the reasoning power of their heads. If they had just studied the political economists and then applied their reasoning to the evidence before them they would not have come to this decision. He would not take up the Bill clause by clause to show the absurdity of the drafting, and to show how ridiculous it was altogether from beginning to end with one or two exceptions. It would only be an injury to those who were accustomed to seek the benefit of loans.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I do not propose to follow the arguments of my hon. friend the Member for Walsall in this discussion. As a matter of fact he has summarised in a very convenient way all the misconceptions that have been formed with regard to this Bill. My hon. friend is under a delusion in supposing that this Bill is intended to fix the rate of interest. One feature that must have struck everyone in regard to this question is that everyone is agreed that there is a great grievance to be remedied in some way. [Cries of "Not at all."] My hon. friend says "Not at all." I am aware of my hon. friend's hardihood in dissent.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): There has been no such expression of universal agreement.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I have listened to the greater part of the debate, and I have not heard any question made of the fact that very great abuses exist in the system of money-lending. If my hon. friend asserts that there are no such abuses he will find very few supporters.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I never asserted anything of the sort.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The second point that has struck me is that two-thirds of this Bill have really not been objected to at all, or, if so, it has only been by way of criticism more suitable for the Committee stage. The only clause which has been attacked on principle is the first clause of the Bill, the most important some people may say, but there are other clauses which are also very important indeed, and which no one has ventured to attack. I think everyone who has inquired into the subject of money-lending must have been struck with the very great mischief that ensues from the practice of persons carrying on a business of this kind under some name which is not their own—as a bank, for instance. One is familiar with advertisements such as this:—"Why go to money-lenders when a private gentleman is prepared to lend money at 5 per cent?" That advertisement is inserted by a professional money-lender, and the dupes who go to him and get involved find that the interest is 5 per cent. per month, and not per year. Surely it is highly desirable that some steps should be taken to ensure that a business of this kind, which is liable to very grave abuses, should be carried on under the real name of the person who is behind the scenes. That is provided for by the second and third clauses of this Bill, and I have heard no attack whatever from any quarter either on the principle or the drafting of the clauses which are intended to suggest a remedy for that evil. And yet the House is being asked not to read the Bill a second time. There is another very important section of the Bill which I have not heard attacked, and which I do not think can be attacked. Everyone must be aware of the mischief that attends the sending of circulars to boys and young men under the age of twenty-one inviting them to gamble or borrow money. Everyone is desirous that a practice of that kind should be put down, but the existing Act is to a great extent inoperative owing to the difficulty of proving that the person sending the circular knew that the person receiving it was a minor. Surely, when circulars of that kind are sent out, it is only right and reasonable that unless the person who issues the circulars can prove that he had reason to suppose that the persons who received them were above age, he should be liable to the penalty which the law imposes. That is the provision contained in the fifth clause, a clause to which, so far, I have heard no objection put forward. There are two other portions of the Bill which have been criticised on questions of detail; one of them is the fourth clause, which provides penalties for false statements and false representations made by money-lenders. It surely is right that in a business so capable of being abused as that of money-lending there should be some sharpening of the remedy for misleading circulars and statements, with which all who have followed the subject are familiar. My hon. friend the Member for the University of Oxford made some criticisms on the definition of money-lender. The whole object of the definition is to ensure that the Bill shall apply only to those whom we all know as being money-lenders in the popular sense of the term. The Bill does not apply to those who genuinely carry on the business of bankers. Bankers lend money, but no one ever talks of a banker as a money-lender; he is not what is popularly known as a money-lender. The Bill is not to apply "to any body corporate, incorporated or empowered (before the passing of this Act) by a special Act of Parliament to lend money, in accordance with such special Act." In like manner, friendly societies and pawnbrokers are exempted. The stress of the attack has been directed at the first section of the Bill, which is the one that provides for strengthening the hands of the Court in setting aside harsh and unconscionable bargains. I think I can satisfy the House that the attack on the clause has proceeded on a radical misconception of its meaning. The hon. and learned Member for West Fife has obviously been refreshing his knowledge of the Pentateuch. He quoted to the House, and he designated me by name, the authority of Moses on the subject. I wish my hon. and learned friend had given a little more time to the reading of the Bill than to the reading of the Pentateuch. There was one passage in the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman to which I listened with a little regret. He made very great fun of a story told to the Committee by Lord Brampton, but I think that everyone who heard the story must have realised that behind it were all the elements of tragedy. It is all very well to make fun of a particular case, but if I possessed the literary talent of my hon. and learned friend, I think I could move the House by drawing a picture of some humble householder who, having fallen into the meshes of some unscrupulous money-lender, is led on from one step to another until total ruin and crime result. The hon. and learned Member for West Fife, referring to the first clause, spoke of the Bill as one to put proof altogether aside. The Bill is not one to do anything of the kind. The words of the clause are that if—

> "the Court has reason to believe that the interest charged in respect of the sum actually lent exceeds the rate of interest mentioned in

the schedule of this Act, or that the amounts charged . . . are excessive, and that in either case the transaction is harsh and unconscionable."

That does not mean if the Judge on some speculation of his own came to that conclusion; it means if the Judge upon the evidence before him came to that conclusion.

MR. BIRRELL: Why don't you say so?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The language can be made clear in Committee if my hon. and learned friend thinks it is open to objection, but that is a pure question of drafting. There is no intention whatever on the part of the framers of the Bill to say that a Judge is to arrive at a conclusion on a matter of fact without any evidence.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: There is no verdict.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: There is no verdict because there is no jury. I do not know what the money-lenders would say to the suggestion that there should be a jury. I am strongly of opinion that they would find the little finger of the jury thicker than the loins of the Judge. The hon. and learned Member for West Fife entirely misunderstood the first clause when he asserted that it fixes the rate of interest. It is not solely because the rate of interest is beyond the scheduled amount that the Judge can interfere with the bargain. It must also be proved that the bargain is "harsh and unconscionable." I submit to the House that the Bill, in point of principle, is not open to objection, and, as matters of drafting can best be considered in Committee, I confidently ask the House to assent to the Second Reading.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): The hon. and learned Member for West Fife seemed to shed tears at the moral lapse of those who on this occasion support this measure. I think, on the other hand, that the Government deserve words of praise for trying to step in and save those people whose necessities compel them to seek the use of money from unscrupulous men, who prey upon their necessities and entrap them in meshes from which it is impossible to escape. The custom of money-lenders is to circulate throughout the country statements offering certain inducements. They state that they are ready to lend money and desire no security, that no questions are asked, and so on. Then when they get the people into their meshes, they place very severe conditions on them. I think 15 per cent. for a small sum of money is reasonable, and I am sure some of the hon. Gentlemen who have protested against this Bill would hesitate long before they paid that rate. I notice that the opposition to the Bill comes altogether from the professional element. I do not see anyone representing the honest workman opposing the Bill. The opposition comes from professional men, and they object to it on account of the encroachment on the personal liberty of the subject. I do not think that any person who has had dealings with a money-lender will believe there can be safeguards too strong to protect the public against these men. I have known instances where people have paid 100 per cent. for a loan, and the weaker the individual the greater are the demands made upon him. The State interferes and says a man should not drink too much whiskey, that he should not get drunk, and it is the duty of the State to interfere in this matter and protect people from these dangerous men. I therefore rise for the purpose simply of saying how glad I am the Government have brought in this measure, and of expressing the hope that they will carry it into law.

MR. H. S. FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I am sure that anyone who listened to the speech of the learned Attorney General must have felt that he himself realised the difficult task he had undertaken in defending on behalf of the Government the main provisions of this Bill. The Attorney General very ingeniously argued that because we object to one clause that is no reason whatever for objecting to the Second Reading. He told us there were six or seven clauses, and that so far he had heard very little criticism of any clause except the first. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Second Reading told us that he anticipated very little objection to any part of the Bill other than the first clause, but that, so far as he was concerned, he valued the first clause as more important than any other part of the measure. That being so it does not seem to be quite frank for the Attorney General to say later on that the discussion has justified the House in reading the Bill a second time because there has been so little said about any clause except the first. Clause 1 is for all purposes that which the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill has described as the essence of the measure, and it is on that ground and that alone that the discussion has waged to-night around the extraordinary provisions of this clause. When I first read this Bill I confess I found it difficult to believe that a responsible Government would make itself responsible for putting such a clause before the House of Commons. If such a proposal were put before a debating society I believe it would be laughed out of discussion, but as it comes from a responsible Government, we are bound to deal with it with some measure of apparent respect. The whole case for this clause is based on appeals to prejudice. In the absence of logical argument to prove there was a weakness in the present law which this proposal was required to make good, all those who have supported the Bill have appealed to the prejudice of the House. Hard cases have been cited, and the hon. Member in charge of the Bill gave us two, one of which was so extraordinary that I marvelled he was not cross-examined upon it. It was a Scotch case, and I was curious to see whether the Attorney General would have an opportunity of explaining the peculiar intricacies of Scotch law as suggested by that case. It was said that some money-lender—I think it was Isaac Gordon—had lent a man two sums of money at two different times—one sum from an office in England and the other from an office in Scotland.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Both sums were lent in England.

MR. H. S. FOSTER: But one of the promissory notes was dated from Glasgow, and the hon. Gentleman told the House the money-lender had an office in Glasgow. I assume, therefore, the money was lent from the Glasgow office; the hon. Gentleman told us nothing to the contrary.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: That is not so. It was expressly stated by the witness himself that although he had an office in Glasgow for this particular purpose, he carried on no business in Glasgow. He had an office in Glasgow for the express purpose of taking bills, but the money was lent from England.

MR. H. S. FOSTER: But it was a Scotch loan unquestionably. The lender was domiciled in Scotland for the purpose of the transaction, or the Scotch Courts could have had nothing whatever to do with it. The hon. Member told us that proceedings were taken against the defaulting debtor. I like to call things by their proper names; my hon. friend would probably say the man got into the meshes of the money-lender, but I say he was a defaulting debtor, and while proceedings were going on in the English Courts with respect to the English loan the bill dated from Glasgow also fell due and was also dishonoured. Thereupon, by some extraordinary process of law, which I should like to hear explained, the money-lender was able to commence an action in Scotland, and continue that process to a judgment without any sort of communication being made to the defendant; and without the defendant being even conscious that proceedings had been initiated, a bailiff was found at his door somewhere in Herefordshire. Is that an accurate statement of what really happened? If so, there is a much more serious grievance for this House to deal with than any question raised by this Bill, namely, that Her Majesty's Courts may be grossly abused for the purpose of oppressing Her Majesty's subjects at the suit of anybody who chooses to go to the Scotch Courts without notice to the defendant, and to say that a transaction which did not take place in Scotland did take place in Scotland—that judgment may be obtained against a person who has had no opportunity of defending himself, that that judgment may be transferred from the Scotch Courts to the English Courts, and in order to enforce a Scotch judgment of that kind an English baliff may be put in possession of the man's goods. The statement is so incredible and extraordinary that until we have further proof I shall venture to believe that the hon. Gentleman's credulity has been imposed upon. Such a case is not sufficient to justify this House in making such an inroad upon the principle of freedom of contract. It may be that there is not the same respect for freedom of contract to-day as there used to be. It may be a very old-fashioned thing for anybody to get up and say that if people of mature age and in possession of their faculties make a bargain, whatever the terms of the bargain may be, the bargain ought, under ordinary circumstances, to be respected. At any rate, I am old-fashioned enough to believe that the principle is a sound one to go upon, and certainly this House ought not to be influenced by such improbable and incredible stories as that to which I have alluded. My hon. friend says that three or four years ago he should have been the last man to support legislation of that kind, but he comes to the House to-day with the usual zeal of the convert—or, I should say, the pervert. He told us that he used to believe in the heresies which he now dismisses. I should rather say that his present view is a very heretical one, and is founded upon having given an undue and abnormal amount of study to the hardships which have been brought before him in a certain number of hard cases. It is a truism that hard cases make bad law, but the hon. Gentleman in this instance is founding his desire for law upon hard cases. The hon. Member for Stepney, in supporting this Bill, cited as a ground for doing so the practice of the workpeople to resort rather to the pawnbrokers than to the money-lenders. Does not the hon. Member know that not only does the pawnbroker obtain ample security for the sum he advances, but he is allowed by law to charge something like 25 per cent., and that as a matter of practice, where the poor are in the habit of redeeming their goods on the Saturday night and pledging them again on Monday morning, the rate of interest he is entitled to charge works out to something nearer 40 per cent. than 20 per cent.? The hon. Gentleman does not consider that to be a hardship, but he cites it as a very desirable instance of the right which ought to be given to poor people to raise small sums of money. I cannot help thinking that a great deal of the prejudice to which appeal is made arises from the confusion in people's minds as to that which a money-lender really does. The money-lender, after all, deals in a commodity the same as any other person. If a man carries on a business for the purpose of lending money, the article in which he has to deal, and upon which he has to make his profit, is money, and he is entitled like any other trader, so long as he resorts to honourable and fair methods, to make the best use he can of the commodity with which he has to deal. Why is it not suggested that every harsh and unconscionable bargain in any other branch of trade should be revised and re-opened? Why should it be said that if a man has money to lend, and lends that money at what a Judge may consider to be an unduly high rate of interest, the debtor is to have the privilege of having that rate revised, while in the case of any other article of commerce, no matter what the bargain may be, no matter how hard it was or how much the debtor needed the goods that were supplied, or how much the profit was, the debtor is not to have the opportunity of re-opening the transaction? If we passed this Bill—although I do not think there is much chance of it—we should not be able to stop here. Once having established the precedent of re-opening a transaction because in the opinion of one of Her Majesty's Judges the terms were unreasonable—for that is all that "unconscionable" means, according to the dictionary—every kind of bargain will have to be liable to revision on the same ground. Another point the Attorney General endeavoured to make was that there were two precautions: first, that the Judge must be satisfied that the rate of interest was more than 15 per cent., and, secondly, that the transaction was harsh and unconscionable, and he seemed to treat those points as two independent propositions. Is it not conceivable that, if we set down here 15 per cent. as the limit above which a Judge may re-open a transaction, if the charge for interest is 20 per cent., that in the opinion of the Judge may be an unconscionable bargain—that the mere fact of the rate of interest being higher than 15 per cent. may be sufficient to indicate to the Judge that the bargain is a harsh and unconscionable one? It is easy, because it is taking the popular side, to abuse the money-lender and to couple with his name the term "unscrupulous." But this Bill is not limited to the unscrupulous. The preamble of the Bill says that many money-lenders have resorted to deceptive methods, and one would have thought that the Bill would have gone on to deal with the money-lenders who "have resorted to deceptive methods." Not at all. As my hon. and learned friend who moved the rejection of the Bill pointed out, if this first clause is passed the Judge is to have thrown upon him the onus of saying what, under all the circumstances, was a fair bargain, and to say what sum is fairly due in respect of principal and interest. I cannot imagine a more irksome or difficult task. The Judge has got to endeavour to put himself into the circumstances of the person carrying out the transaction; he has to appreciate the risk which the lender had to incur, he has to fix the rate quite apart from the circumstances and the actual terms of the agreement entered into between debtor and creditor. The result must depend upon the Court in which the case may happen to be tried and the idiosyncrasies of the Judge who happens to preside. The risk which the money-lender will run of having his bargains upset will have to be paid for by those who borrow; in other words, instead of lightening the burden of the borrower the money-lender will require to exact a higher rate of interest for the money he lends in order to cover this additional risk. I have made it my business to inquire into one or two of these cases. I had a case presented to me of a money-lending company carrying on business at four or five places, and I found that the average charge they made was 35 per cent., but notwithstanding that they were able to pay to their shareholders a dividend of only 11 per cent. Their working expenses were from 15 to 20 per cent. of their profits, they were obliged to keep up a staff for making inquiries and so on and to keep the books of account, and where money was received by instalments a great deal of expense was incurred in keeping people up to date in their payments. In addition to that, they incurred a loss of something like 10 per cent. of the total amount of their loans through bad debts. The House must remember that the class of people who go to money-lenders are those who cannot go to their bankers to borrow on good security; they have not any good securities, and their credit at the bank is exhausted. The result is that the money-lender is carrying on an exceedingly risky business; everybody knows that a high rate of interest always means a heavy risk. The experience of money-lenders seems to be that although a man may charge 25 or 30 per cent. for short periods he does not make much more than a decent living, and if you are going to introduce provisions into the law whereby you are going in effect to make it impossible to carry on that business and at the same time to make a living you are going to make it impossible to lend money unless a man has a banker's security. The learned Attorney General rather complained that we had not criticised other portions of the Bill. If he is going to interpret silence or absence of criticism as approval of the Bill I have no doubt that from every part of the House criticisms will come with regard to the other clauses. Clause 4 seems to be a most unfair clause, rendering a money-lender liable to prosecution on the mere *ipse dixit* of a borrower who does not wish to repay his debt. If legislation of this kind is to be introduced against the money-lender, I would ask whether it is not equitable that the money borrower should be liable to exactly the same penalties for making similar misrepresentations. In the case of the lender he has been induced to part with his money, but in the case of the borrower it is not until after he has obtained the money, and is called upon to repay, that the difficulty arises, and I certainly think similar penalties should apply to the borrower as to the lender. I trust the House will not accept the second reading of this Bill. If the second reading is carried I hope the Government will make some announcement which will disarm much of the hostility to this first clause. If that clause ever was placed in an Act of Parliament it would not only transgress all those principles of political economy in which we have been taught to believe, but it would open up a vista of future legislation which would be fraught with very great danger to the country. *The Times* newspaper, which might have some influence with Members of the Government, in a leading article on this subject not long ago said—

> "Lord James expressed the hope that the Bill would become law before the close of the present session. We are not sure that this will be or ought to be the case, unless the clause giving the courts authority to reopen contracts is withdrawn. Under the existing law there is power to deal with cases of fraud and misrepresentation, and to allow public Judges to interfere in bargains between man

and man however hard they may appear to be, where no fraud or misrepresentation can be alleged, is a step back to the Dark Ages."

We are all in favour of strengthening the law if required in any case of fraud or misrepresentation with regard to money-lending. If my hon. friend's case is that these money-lenders do resort to fraud, misrepresentations, or deceptive methods, which are not covered by the law as it at present stands, by all means let us strengthen the law. But this Bill goes much further than any proposal of that kind, and for that reason I support the motion for its rejection.

MR. LYTTELTON (Warwick and Leamington): I did not intend to trouble the House, but inasmuch as there appear to be a considerable number of speakers on this side objecting to this Bill I desire to say in a few sentences the reasons I have for upholding it. No candid man can dispute that there are difficulties in and objections to submitting bargains made between adults of full mental capacity to the revision of Judges, many of whom differ widely as regards the principle which should be applied to such cases. Nobody can dispute that different minds would probably take different views of such cases, and it is quite likely that Judges in one place would give decisions widely conflicting with the decisions of Judges in other parts of the country. But that is not a difficulty which exists for the first time. For my part I think the present is a far greater scandal than would exist if this proposed legislation were carried into effect. I take it as beyond controversy in this matter that there are constantly scandalous cases of hardship by which the poor suffer at the hands of money-lenders. That has been established beyond all doubt. What is the result? Cases are brought before the Courts by money-lenders, and can anything be more disastrous to the administration of the law in this country than that the Judges appointed and sworn to administer the law are, by the very hardship of the cases brought before them, almost compelled to evade their duty, and not to administer the law as they swore to do? If the hon. and learned Member opposite ever visited a County Court he would see the stress in which the Judge is placed if he has before him this dilemma: "Am I to administer the law of the land which I am sworn to administer, or am I to give the wretched rascal who comes before me the very life-blood of his victim?" That is what it really comes to. What is the answer? The answer is, "I will take any course I can to avoid ruining this unfortunate man who is brought before me." I respectfully submit to the House that that brings upon the community at large, and especially upon those who admire and respect and believe in the law, a most serious scandal and difficulty, for it places those who have been sworn to administer the law in the position of struggling to evade it. Further, it is most disastrous for a Judge, for there is a great temptation to extend it to subsequent cases. Once a Judge has been shown the way, with the approval of others, not to administer but to evade the law, and to follow his own opinion, the House may easily judge how tempting it is for him to set up his own opinion against the law of the land, and to administer what he calls right and equity in other cases contrary to the law of the country. Stress has been laid upon the onerous task which is laid upon the Judge in deciding not questions of law, but questions which no doubt are of economics. But that is no new thing. For centuries the Judges have had to decide upon the legality of covenants in restraint of trade, which is an economic matter. But nothing disastrous has ever happened to the community by reason of the Judges having to decide upon that most important matter. I may take another illustration. For many years the law of conspiracy—a far more delicate and a most difficult matter—was in the hands of the Judges; it was within their discretion to say whether a combination of two or more people was likely to effect something *contra bonos mores*, and in many other matters with regard to trade the law of conspiracy frequently placed the Judges in a position of the greatest possible difficulty and delicacy. They have had for many generations to decide upon questions of custom—a custom which prevails in a trade—whether that custom is reasonable or unreasonable. The Judge is asked in these cases to say whether a bargain is or is not harsh and unconscionable. That the task is difficult no candid man will deny, but it is a task they have set themselves to perform already, as moneylenders appearing before the Courts have found. How much better it is in the interests of all concerned that that proceeding which has already begun should be legalised and made part of the law of the land. For these reasons, though I do not dispute for a moment the soundness of many of the objections which have been made against the Bill, some of which no doubt will prevail in the Committee stage, I shall support the Second Reading, as the state of things which this Bill will bring about is merely that of regulating and ordering that which already obtains.

*MR. HAZELL (Leicester), as a member of the Committee of whose labours this Bill was the result, congratulated the Government on bringing in the measure, and expressed the hope that it would be carried into law, although he was not in love with all its details, some of which would have to be modified in Committee. To those who heard the witnesses give their evidence many of the arguments advanced against the Bill appeared illogical and unsound. It was assumed by many that these bargains were made between two persons meeting on equal terms and with their eyes open. The eyes of the lenders were very clearly open, but that could not always be said of the borrowers. The Committee heard of cases without number in which astute money lenders, learned in the law of debtor and creditor, dealt with people who were absolutely unlearned in the law, and who had no conception of the nature of the bargain into which they had entered until they found themselves practically ruined. No doubt there were many reasonable moneylenders and many unreasonable borrowers, and an effective Bill of this kind would strengthen the hands and improve the business of men who were *bona fide* lending small sums of money at rates of interest which might appear high, but which under the circumstances were not extortionate, and it would squeeze out of the business those who used oppression as a means of livelihood. Their circulars were often so misleading that when they were not absolutely untrue, they required a very expert person to understand exactly what they meant. No doubt the people who were victimised were foolish and blameworthy, but there were a great number of people whose knowledge of business affairs was so small that it was not fair to face them with people who were extremely acute in one branch of the law, and perhaps one only. The Committee took the evidence of over forty witnesses, and with the exception of one hon. Member the Report was absolutely unanimous. There could be no doubt whatever that registration of these lenders was very desirable. It was the duty of the Government to carry the Bill through, and he was sure that with proper handling in Committee it would be a very useful and important measure.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I do hope that the House will pass the second Reading of this Bill. I should like to say half-a-dozen words with reference to one class of persons in particular who are peculiarly the victims of these thieves—I have been through the mill myself—I mean with reference to the position of the British officer, or rather the British subaltern, who is peculiarly their victim. That ineffable Department, the War Office, has provided that certain regiments should be so hopelessly and ridiculously expensive that it is absolutely impossible for the son of a country gentleman to live in them. The War Office seem to prefer to fill the commissioned ranks with South African Jews and American millionaires rather than with Englishmen. The result is that, in certain cases, a son of an English country gentleman gets into one of these expensive cavalry regiments. Either the regiment give a ball or a mess dinner, or his brother officers buy polo ponies at £200 apiece, or the War Office alter the whole of his kit from blue to red, or they put the regiment on piebald horses instead of brown horses. The result is that the young officer does not do what he should do, and he finds himself unable to get on and to pay his mess bill. The boy does not go to his father for help, but he invokes the aid of "the man round the corner," and pays 50 or 60 per cent. for a loan. This goes on until the money-lender gets him fairly on his hooks. The money lender then writes to the War Office, and the War Office writes to the boy's parents, and the boy has to retire. The result is that the boy is ruined, and he becomes a club loafer, or drives a hansom, or even becomes a lawyer, and his career is absolutely ruined. What I say is that the only way to stamp out this pernicious breed is to pass some such Bill as the Government have now placed before the House, in order that the boy, like the Prodigal Son in the parable, can go to his father in the first instance instead of having that association with the swine. I hope the House will not pay too much attention to the false sentiment so admirably expressed by my hon. friend the Member for West Fife. It is the duty of the House to extend its protection to other people besides the class to which my hon. friend has alluded.

MR. MADDISON (Sheffield, Brightside): I have listened to a large part of this debate, and the most peculiar thing about it has been an attempt to show that the money-lender is a blessing to the working classes. I have not a keen sense of humour, but I do certainly appreciate that joke. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Fife in his brilliant speech entirely marred it when he attempted to indulge in that special pleading about the poor people who had to go to the money-lender in their time of dire necessity. I quite agree that there are many respectable money-lenders, but I do not like very much this first clause. I think myself that there is a tendency in our just zeal against excesses to do injury to those who may be respectable members of that particular class. I have been very much interested in the somewhat frequent quotations from Jeremy Bentham, and I am bound to say that when those quotations came from the mouth of the hon. Member for Walsall I began to have a somewhat serious regard for that great philosopher. But, after all, are the hon. Gentlemen who have quoted Jeremy Bentham so freely prepared to follow him in his philosophy? Very likely the hon. Member for West Fife would, but the hon. Member for Walsall is a living contradiction of Bentham's philosophy from beginning to end. I have a profound respect for that brilliant group of utilitarians of which Bentham and the elder Mill formed such a prominent part, but are hon. Members who have quoted from them not aware that, like most doctrinaires, they made no exceptions to their rule, and thus you have John Stuart Mill, in his love of liberty, actually opposing any attempt to deal with the sale of poisons, for he believed in freedom to poison yourself or other people. I think in all these matters of freedom our experience has shown that you must in a civilised community regulate it, for it is regulation which, after all, has given us the best results. So far as I am concerned, I believe that if you were to deprive the poor amongst the working classes of all money-lenders good and bad, the net result to the working classes would be distinctly good. It was really amusing to hear the hon. Member for Walsall discoursing upon this point in such a fluent way, that one could hardly keep pace with him as he gave us those high economics as to how the value of money was regulated by the law of supply and demand. I had my mind upon some poor wretched man who has gone wrong with his accounts, some miserable clerk who has got wrong to the extent of £20 or £30 with his accounts. He goes to one of these money-lenders, and in his extremity and dire necessity he becomes a hopeless victim in the hands of these unscrupulous men. The result is that this poor man becomes absolutely helpless and hopeless in the hands of the money-lender. That is only one type. There can be no freedom of contract or any real contract between a man who possesses money and another man who does not possess it and must have it. In that dire necessity the borrower is prepared to enter into a contract which, I venture to say, would not be considered fair, and should not be considered fair, by any civilised community. Although I agree in principle with this Bill, I wish to say that I shall support any Amendment which gives it more effect in the direction I have indicated, for it is an attempt to interfere not with what I would call the regular forces of commerce, but with the brigands of commerce, and just as you would treat a regular army very different from what you would treat a band of brigands, so I think this House is justified in adopting the same policy with respect to money-lenders. It has been said that this Bill really fixes a certain rate of interest. It is needless to say that I am not a lawyer, but in reading this Bill through I must say that I could not get that meaning out of the measure. I admit that the scheduled rates of interest establish an indication to the Judges, but the clause distinctly says that if the scheduled rate of interest has been exceeded the court may reopen the transaction, and I take it that in the reopening due regard would be had even where the scheduled rate of interest had been exceeded to the peculiar circumstances of the case. Without wishing to occupy the time of the House any further, I do give to this Bill my support, not because I agree with every detail of it, but because, first of all, I think a real evil has been made out, and no one has attempted to deny it. The evil exists, and hon. Members who are opposing this Bill are evidently prepared to allow that evil to go on until it reaches almost the open form of fraud. I take that to be the case. I think we can very rightly, without encroaching upon the freedom of trade, take this step. I wish to say before I sit down, in support of my hon. friend the Member for Stepney, that the real truth is that we have already in some parts of the country—and I am glad to hear that we have them in Stepney—banks and other places where this difficulty has been solved completely. The hon. Member for Leicester could tell us of the good work that co-operative banks are doing at the present time, and there is no need for the working classes to depend on these money-lenders either bad or good. But whatever may be said against this Bill, do not let it be said that it would, in any sort of way, injure the best interests of the working classes. Money-lending is a great curse, and it does an enormous amount of injury to the working classes, for it gets them into habits which affect them for a lifetime.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Marks*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

INEBRIATES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAN) BILL [Lords].

Order read, for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [18th June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate resumed.

It being midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

POST OFFICE SITES [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all sums payable by the Postmaster General under any Act of the present session to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire lands for the Public Service, and of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect the Provisions of such Act.—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

COUNTY COURTS (INVESTMENT OF DEPOSITS) BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause I:—

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS AND GUARDIANS (TERM OF OFFICE) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without amendment; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL (SELECT COMMITTEE.)

Ordered, That Mr. Hazell be discharged from the Select Committee on the Registration of Firms Bill.

Ordered, That Mr. Mendl be a Member of the Committee. — (*Mr. William M'Arthur.*)

G.P.O.—TRANSFER TO MOUNT PLEASANT — POSTAL RE-ARRANGEMENTS, DELAYS, ETC.

On the motion for adjournment,

MR. EGERTON (Cheshire, Knutsford): I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury a question of which I have given him private notice. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will take immediate steps to remedy the delays in the delivery of letters due to the absence of an adequate staff at the new offices at Mount Pleasant.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I am aware that there is considerable difficulty in connection with the transfer of certain duties to Mount Pleasant, but I thought they were confined to the newspaper post and the book post. I am sorry to hear that those difficulties apply to the letter post also. I think my hon. friend is wrong in saying that even if those difficulties have arisen they are due to an inadequate staff. I have heard nothing of that, and no representations have been made to me on the subject. What has happened is this. Although the staff is adequate, they have been working at considerable inconvenience and under considerable difficulties owing to the fact that some 2,500 men have been transferred to the new office. Of course, it will take some short time for them to accommodate themselves to their new surroundings, and although they are working under difficulties which did not exist in the old office, I am assured that within a very few days those difficulties will be removed, and I hope my hon. friend will then have no cause to complain. I will communicate with the Postmaster-General to-morrow morning, and urge the Post Office officials to remove the difficulties as soon as possible.

MR. EGERTON: I am advised that a bag of letters was sent to the North in mistake and was returned.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it was absolutely necessary to change the hours of posting. The change has caused the very greatest inconvenience to all classes of persons engaged in business not only in London but in every part of the country. I certainly think that if the change was not absolutely necessary, it was a very strong step to take to alter the hours of departure of the mails, which I believe have hardly been changed for a generation. If the right hon. Gentleman would extend his inquiries so far as to see whether it would be possible to resume the old hours, either by some arrangement in the office, or by some arrangement in connection with the railway companies, I am sure it would give the greatest satisfaction.

MR. HANBURY: I will also make inquiries into that matter.

Adjourned at ten minutes after
Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 22nd June, 1900.

SAT FIRST.

The Viscount Clancarty (*E. Clancarty*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

Farnworth Urban District Council.
Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas, and South Metropolitan Gas Companies.
Halifax Corporation.
Huddersfield Corporation Tramways.
Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply.
Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway.
Lambeth Water.
London and Saint Katherine Docks and East and West India Dock Companies.
Mid-Kent Water.
Portland Urban District Gas.
Southport and Lytham Tramroad.
Wandsworth and Putney Gas.

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 1).

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have not been complied with:—

South Metropolitan Gas.
Metropolitan District Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

ROE'S PATENT BILL [H.L.].

Presented (pursuant to leave given this day), and read 1^{a}.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL.

Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday next.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Petition for Roe's Patent Bill ought to be dispensed with, and leave given to introduce the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Petition for the Alexandra Park Bill ought to be dispensed with.

Read, and agreed to.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 3rd and 28th of May last discharged; and Bill committed.

MANCHESTER CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

HAMILTON BURGH BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

ILFRACOMBE IMPROVEMENT BILL.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (IMPROVEMENTS) BILL.

Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

WALSALL CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

COWES PIER BILL [H.L.].

GREAT CENTRAL RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

MOTHERWELL WATER BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [H.L.].

(Bootle Corporation, Radcliffe Urban District Council, and St. Helens Corporation Orders *opposed.*)

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 3) BILL [H.L.].

Batley Corporation, Camborne and Redruth, East Ham Urban District Council, Hull Corporation, Portobello and Musselburgh, and Southampton Corporation Orders *opposed.*)

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 4) BILL [H.L.].

(Garston and Warrington Corporation Orders *opposed.*)

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz :—

D. Northumberland (chairman) ;
M. Camden,
E. Lindsey,
V. Frankfort de Montmorency,
L. Saye and Sele ;

agreed to ; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Wednesday next, at Eleven o'clock, and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Ordered that Standing Orders Nos. 72 and 82 be suspended for the remainder of the Session.

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made : Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (PETERSHAM) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without amendment ; Standing Committee negatived ; and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 TO 1890 (PROCEEDINGS).

Report by the Board of Trade respecting the applications to and proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1890, during the past year.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Two Orders, Nos. 6092 and 6106, dated the 16th ultimo and 16th instant respectively, revoking certain Orders of the Board relating to the landing of foreign animals.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Select Committee (with proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 119). Bill reported with Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next ; and to be printed as amended. (No. 118.)

LAND CHARGES BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments to be printed. (No. 120.)

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Brought from the Commons ; read 1^a ; to be printed ; and to be read 2^a on Thursday next.—(*The Lord James of Hereford.*) (No. 121.)

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Committee have added the Lord Kinnaird to the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Report from, That the Committee have added the Viscount Frankfort de Montmorency to the Standing Committee for the consideration of the Military Lands Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

UGANDA RAILWAY BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived. Then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to Order), and dispensed with. Bill read 3^a, and passed.

RESERVE FORCES BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, as I fully explained the objects of this Bill in moving its First Reading, I propose to formally move that it be read a second time; but I shall be glad to give any further information which may be desired as to the provisions of the measure.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

LORD MONKSWELL: In Clause 2 of this Bill there is another instance of legislation by reference. I do not know whether the noble Marquess has considered the wording of Clause 2. It alters in certain particulars quite a short sub-section of Section 10 of the Reserve Forces Act, 1882, and I would suggest that it would be well to incorporate the sub-section instead of referring to it.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I will gladly consider the suggestion of the noble Lord, but I would point out that this is certainly not a case of referential legislation of the kind to which he called attention last night.

LORD MONKSWELL: I quite understand that. What I complain of is that there is nothing in this Act which shows what the nature of the alteration is.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL [H.L.].

Read 2^a (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

COLONIAL MARRIAGES (DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER) BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I do not propose to offer any further opposition to this Bill; but I think it right, in view of what was said on the Second Reading by the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition and the noble and learned Lord, Lord Davey, to inform your Lordships that the opinions expressed by the Colonial delegates, which I quoted, are to be found in a Parliamentary Paper. The conference was initiated by Mr. Stanhope in 1887, and held in the following year, and a great number of colonies were represented. Their discussions are published, and noble Lords can convince themselves by looking at the Paper that the statement I made was quite correct—namely, that the representative of Canada and one or two others expressed the opinion that, while they wished their own law to be what they desired it to be in this respect, they quite recognised the reasonableness of this country keeping to its own law of inheritance.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 3^a accordingly, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

IMITATION OF COUNTY COURT PROCESS BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, this is a Bill to amend the law with regard to the imitation of County Court process, and is rendered necessary by people doing such things as placing the Royal Arms at the head of documents demanding the payment of debts, and in various other ways imitating County Court process. This practice is a serious thing to the most ignorant of the population, and is attended with considerable iniquity. Of course it is an offence which may be proceeded against by a more serious and lengthy process, but the complicated nature of this process practically prevents the law being put in force. The Bill before your Lordships gives more summary powers. It enacts that—

> "If any person, with intent to deceive, issues any document in imitation of or resembling the process of a County Court, or entitled so as to resemble County Court process, he shall be liable, on the order of a Judge of County Courts, to a fine not exceeding ten pounds, and in default of payment of the fine the Judge may commit him to any prison to which he has power to commit offenders for any time not exceeding fourteen days, unless the said fine be sooner paid."

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): I have no doubt that every one of your Lordships who has considered this question will entirely concur with the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack that it is most desirable that such a measure as this should be passed to prevent the imitation of County Court process in the way described. I have received representations from the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland asking that the benefits of this legislation should be extended to that country. I have read the Bill, and so far as I can see it does extend to Ireland; but if there is any doubt on that point I am sure the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack will consider it at a later stage.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

COUNTY SURVEYORS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: My Lords, this is a very simple Bill. Its object is to obviate the unnecessary examinations which county surveyors in Ireland have to undergo. At the present time, if a county surveyor is transferred from one county to another, he has to pass his qualifying examination a second time. This Bill is drawn at the request of the Civil Service Commissioners for the purpose of obviating this unnecessary examination.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Earl of Denbigh.*)

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five of the clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 22*nd June*, 1900.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW, ETC.

Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, have leave to sit this day during the Sitting of the House.—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BIRMINGHAM (KING EDWARD THE SIXTH) SCHOOLS BILL [Lords] (BY ORDER).

Order for Third Reading Read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I rise to move the motion which stands in my name, and I should like at once to say that I take this course not because I wish in any way to cast reflection on the educational efficiency of the great schools of Birmingham—on the contrary, I do not suppose there is any educational system in the country which is better administered, or more successful, than the schools which are governed by the governing body of the Birmingham schools, and I may say that they are the envy of many other towns in which there is not by any means so complete an organisation, beginning with the Board schools and going up to the University—but my reason for objection to the Bill is totally different. I object to it because I think it is highly undesirable that by a private Bill a very grave alteration should be made in the general law of the country. Until this Bill was introduced I do not suppose there was a single case in which a body administering public funds and entrusted with the care of public money was not directly under the control of some Department representing the interests of the public, and I think it is specially needful that with regard to large and excellent schools of this kind the voice of the public should be heard in regard to the administration of its property. The system is one which exists through the whole of our political and public organisations, beginning with the Public Accounts Committee, where public funds have to be administered. This is purely a business arrangement, and it does not cast any stigma upon the authorities who are thus put under control, it merely ensures the bringing of fresh and impartial minds to bear upon proposals made for improving the work of the trustees, or for dealing with the corpus of this property. Another objection which I make to this departure is, that if an alteration is needed in the law of the land it should be effected by a public Act applying to all foundations alike, and provided with all necessary safeguards, and not by a private Bill applying only to one place. On a former stage of this Bill the Chairman of Ways and Means related to us a very remarkable instance of the value of the public control which I wish to see retained. It was a case in which the M.C.C., a body essentially appointed for the purpose of securing high and honourable conduct in the prosecution of our great national game, desired to purchase certain property from the Clergy Orphan School. The two bodies came to an agreement, fixing the price of certain land at £16,000, but when the matter came before the Charity Commissioner the sum was raised to £40,000, showing conclusively that men of most perfect honour and of the highest capacity might be deceived as to the value of the property with which they were dealing. In the Bill now before us there is no safeguard such as would prevent a similar mistake being made in dealing with the property of this foundation. The provision substituted for the safeguard is that if three of the Governors object to any particular transaction they may appeal to the Board of Education. But that does not in the least meet the difficulty. It is not the case of the fraudulent or improvident trustee that we have to deal with. We have to deal with the possibility that an honest mistake may be made by the whole governing body, and we want, therefore, the safeguard of an impartial and external mind to review these transactions. The action of the promotors of this Bill is essentially undemocratic, for it gives to wealth and political influence a power of dispensing with the general law which humbler bodies cannot exercise. It is suggested that the Court of Chancery should have some kind of undefined power, but the clause introduced by the Chairman of Ways and Means simply says, "the general jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery." But the clause would only apply in the case of such gross misconduct as would justify the Attorney General in laying an information before the Court, and that is not what is wanted. What is wanted by those who regard this Bill as a precedent for future legislation is to secure the external control of some impartial persons as a matter of administration, and not as a matter of litigation. Then, we object to the remarkable limitation by which the qualification for trustees is that they shall be residents or ratepayers carrying on business within a convenient distance of Birmingham. Again, the trustees propose to take power to appoint their own auditors. I do not suppose there is a single public body in this country which has this power: even the Auditor General is an independent authority, and I believe that educationalists are consistently in favour of insisting upon an outside audit of the accounts of elementary schools. Before I sit down I wish to make a personal observation. An hon. Member the other day said I was not opposed to the Bill. I fear he rather misconceived the upshot of a very hasty conversation I had with him. What I intended to convey to his mind was that I did not object to the educational provisions of the Bill, for some of them I admit are admirable, but I did object to the fact that the Bill gives a private privilege which, if given at all, ought to have been given by public Bill.

*Mr. BOND (Nottingham, E.): I wish to second the resolution. I do so with reluctance, but I think the question of the practice of the House and of public policy is involved. I found myself on the opinion of Sir Erskine May, who has said—

> "It has been questioned whether a public Act may properly be repealed or amended by a private Bill; and undoubtedly such provisions demand peculiar vigilance, lest public laws be lightly set aside for the benefit of particular persons or places."

I think the House will agree with that view, and will admit that when a Bill of this kind is brought before us, by which it is proposed to confer peculiar and exceptional privileges upon a particular place or charitable foundation, we ought to inquire very carefully whether a case is made out for a departure from the regular procedure in such matters. This Bill is in effect a scheme for the regulation of the foundation of a great and important educational institution in the city of Birmingham. With many of its provisions I do not quarrel, but I think it will be generally recognised that an endeavour to remodel an educational foundation by way of a Bill rather than by the usual and accepted method of a scheme carried through under the sanction of the Charity Commission, is an exceedingly unusual and rather hazardous departure. There is very little in this Bill which could not have been done in the ordinary regular way. The greater part of it is a repetition of the provisions of the existing scheme, under which great educational work has been done, and the only reason for coming to this House at all is that on two points it is sought to alter the general law in favour of this particular institution. This educational endowment claims the privilege of not having its scheme altered except upon the application of its own governing body, whereas nearly all the educational institutions of the country which come under the operation of the Endowed Schools Act can have a fresh scheme on the initiative of the Charity Commission or the Board of Education. That, however, is a comparatively minor point. The really important point is that the governors of this school claim to be exempt from that proper control over the disposition of the funds committed to their charge which exists in the case of every other charitable foundation within the limits of England and Wales. That is a perilous departure, and one would like to know upon what grounds it is defended. I am within the recollection of the House when I say that no attempt has so far been made to defend the provision beyond the putting forward of certain allegations that the Charity Commissioners are an interfering body—that they interfere in trivial and trumpery matters, and that the foundation of King Edward's School is so admirably administered that safeguards deemed necessary for all other foundations may be safely dispensed with in their case. But the fact is that the Charity Commissioners have no power to interfere, except in important matters, when leases of more than twenty-one years are being granted, or when it is proposed to alienate the property of the charitable endowment. It is a matter of common notoriety that there are many charities in this country equally as well managed as this Birmingham endowment, and one does not quite see why an exception should be made in favour of a particular city or a particular institution in that city. And there are reasons which should influence the House in being particularly careful not to grant an exemption in this particular case. The governing body of King Edward's School is composed mainly of representatives of the Corporation. The control and disposition of the property of this charity rests largely with the members of the Corporation, and knowing as we do how active and enterprising is the Corporation of Birmingham in matters of reform and of the development of the city, we must see it is highly probable that dealings may take place between the governors of the charity and the City Corporation. These gentlemen would find themselves in an exceedingly difficult position, a position in which the financial interests of the charity might be at variance with the financial interests of the Corporation. I think that that is a position in which they ought not to be placed. We were told the other day that the governing body of the school were tired of the Charity Commissioners — a statement which elicited a sympathetic response from various quarters of the House. But whether they are tired or not, under this Bill they would no longer remain under the control of the Charity Commissioners. They would be placed under the control of the Board of Education, and all this trouble would have been saved and much debate would have been avoided if only the governors had been willing to accept the transfer of the powers of the Charity Commissioners to the Board of Education without trying to limit those powers in one or two important particulars. I hope I have made out my case that this Bill involves a departure from the practice of the House, which might lead to mischievous consequences, and I trust, therefore, that the motion which I have the honour of seconding will be carried.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'That this House declines to proceed with a private Bill specially exempting one Foundation from the State control imposed by the general law upon all Charitable Foundations, including the Universities and Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge.'"—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I interpose in this debate not because the locality I have the honour to represent is very proud of and deeply interested in this school, but because I want to remove the question from the local questions of Birmingham to the list of what I would call broad questions of public policy. I have taken some part in this House in developing our system of local government, and I am strongly opposed to centralisation, which, I believe, is one of the greatest dangers that we have before us in reference to our vast and over-charged administrative Departments. I have also been opposed for the last twenty years to the policy, and especially to the educational policy, of the Charity Commissioners, but I do not wish to introduce that element into the present consideration. I should, indeed, be the last to cast any reflection either on their *personnel* or their business capacity, for I shall never forget the assistance I received from the then head of the Charity Commissioners in carrying through Parliament in 1894 the Parish Councils Bill. Whatever criticism I have to offer is entirely one of policy. The real question on which my hon. friends differ from the policy of this Bill is that it is exceptional legislation — that it is legislation on behalf of one community and one foundation which does not extend to other foundations and other communities. My hon. friends think that any alteration in the law should be made by a public Act applying to all charities alike. I defend the Bill upon that ground. If the general law lays down certain conditions applicable to every individual of every corporation, it is clearly right that the general law alone should qualify it or modify it, but this Bill is founded in its inception and administration entirely upon exception. I defend this exceptional legislation as a matter of convenience. It would be absolutely impossible to deal with this question in any other way. We must deal with each individual case on its own merits. The Charity Commissioners have 22,084 charities registered under their control, and last year they made nearly forty thousand Orders. It would be impossible to introduce any general law and say that the whole of them should be exempted. Each must be looked at upon its own merits. The overwhelming majority of charities possibly ought not to be exempted; the very constitution of the trust and the circumstances in which it is carried on show that it is necessary to have a centralising and controlling authority. If you admit the principle of exemption, then I allow that Birmingham is not the only place entitled to have exemption; in fact, one gathers from the press that there are many bodies in Lancashire and Yorkshire which are likely to make early application to Parliament for similar exemption. But somebody must break the ice, and someone must go first to the necessary expense to obtain the sanction of Parliament, that these cases may be considered on their individual merits. Complaint has been made of the interference of the Charity Commissioners. I understand that the King Edward School in Birmingham has 700 leases under its control. Is it wise that the trustees of property of that description should be controlled in all their operations by a central authority sitting in London, who must be, and are, absolutely ignorant of all local conditions of the case, and that they should be exposed to enormous delays and to very considerable expense? The nature of this Birmingham charity ought to be considered. This charity has an income of nearly £50,000 a year. There are two high grade schools for boys and girls, and eight grammar schools; we have, in fact, a complete educational system which I venture to say cannot be surpassed in any other city in the kingdom. The board of governors is to consist of twenty-two members. Eight of these governors are to be elected by the Corporation of Birmingham, and five are to be nominated by the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, London and Birmingham, and by the teachers of both sexes in the schools. Another condition is that nine other members of the board shall be citizens of Birmingham. Cannot a body elected like that be trusted? In the light of public opinion in Birmingham, can it not be trusted to manage the affairs of the Birmingham foundation school, and does it require to be checked by an outside body? It is, after all, not an unchecked control. It is practically subject to the control of the Board of Education, with one qualification with reference to the management of their property, and it is that if any three members of the board of trustees object to any resolution of the other body of trustees, they have a right of appeal to the Board of Education, whose decision is absolute and final. If the promoters of the Bill had inserted a clause that any one member of the board of trustees should have a right of appeal, I think that no harm would have been done. What was the danger apprehended by the proposers of the Bill? The danger was misappropriation or misjudgment.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Incapacity.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: Well, incapacity and misappropriation. I venture to say that the board of governors elected in the way I have stated are quite capable of dealing properly with the funds of the trust. But there is such a thing as public opinion in Birmingham—in fact, nowhere is it keener—and I am certain that any misappropriation of the funds, or any folly with regard to education on the part of the trustees would meet with a very sharp condemnation from the public opinion of Birmingham. But another check has, on the suggestion of the Chairman of Ways and Means, been inserted in the Bill during its progress through Parliament. I may say I am not quite satisfied with the wording of the clause, but the object is that the Court of Chancery shall remain in possession of its inherent right, as the guardian of all charities, to interfere in the case of any breach of the trust. Therefore, any individual in Birmingham will have the right, in the event of any misuse or abuse of the trust, to ask the Attorney General to file an information in order to prevent it. The ingenuity of check has been exhausted in this Bill. The scheme is enormously superior to the present one, and it will greatly improve the efficient working of this great foundation. I rather detected in the speech of the hon. Member for Thirsk on the occasion of the last debate a spirit of rivalry and scepticism with reference to the Board of Education. He alluded in a tone somewhat of dissatisfaction to the fact that the Board of Education was represented in this House on the Ministerial Benches, while the Charity Commission was not. But that is one of the grounds for the superiority of the Board of Education; we have all along desired that the Board of Education should be represented in this House by a responsible Minister. Because I believe the time has come for decentralisation not only in education, but in a great many other departments, because I desire to strengthen the local authority of the schools by giving them more power and responsibility, and because I believe the Bill will be to the advantage of the schools, I intend to vote for it.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): The right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken has approved of legislating in this matter by means of a private Bill. He has told us there are 22,000 charities registered in the books of the Charity Commission; fancy having 22,000 private Bills to deal with them.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I am sure the hon. Member does not wish to misrepresent what I said. I did not propose we should have 22,000 private Bills. I distinctly said that the overwhelming majority of these cases should remain subject to the general law.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: The right hon. Gentleman has mentioned that there are exceptions already under the Charitable Trusts Acts, but in all those cases where the foundation is exempted from the control of the Charity Commission it is only because they have been placed under the Board of Agriculture. In opposing this Bill I am not acting officially on behalf of the Charity Commissioners. We felt it our duty to call the attention of the House to the Bill and its peculiar provisions, and having discharged that duty we leave the Bill to the instructed intelligence of the House. Speaking as a Member of the House and not as a Charity Commissioner, I desire to call attention to some very peculiar provisions of the Bill, and to state the reasons why I shall vote against it. In the first place, there is no provision, so far as I can see—as there is in the existing scheme—for the gradual replacement of capital expended on buildings. The House will have on this occasion to judge on the merits of the case, and not on the merits or demerits of the Charity Commissioners. I think it is eminently wise that the interests of future generations in charitable endowments should be protected by the continuous care of some outside body. That care now exists under the general law, but if this Bill passes that will cease to be the case. I see no reason why an exception should be made in the case of this particular foundation. The only justification that has been offered for this Bill is, in fact, that this school is very rich. Surely that is a reason why the governors should be sorry rather than glad to be exempt from the protection of the general law. Then, I think it is a very bad thing that the law of real property should vary, as it will do if this Bill passes, because a conveyance of lands belonging to this charity will be good as regards this charity, but will convey no title in the case of charity lands in any other part of the kingdom. Finally, I think to allow this Bill to pass will be to set a bad example. It will encourage other endowments and foundations to come here by the same system of private Bill legislation to obtain exceptional legislation for them. That is a twofold evil. It wastes the funds of the charity in the promotion of Bills in Parliament, and it wastes the time of the House. We will have, if this Bill passes, a continuous succession of Bills brought in by schools to set up special conditions for themselves. The Leader of the House has spoken of four debates on this Bill, but if we encourage such Bills as this there will be 400 debates.

*MR. LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston): I do not propose on the present occasion to enter at any length into the merits of this Bill, because the grounds upon which the Members for Birmingham unanimously support it have been laid very fully before the House on several previous occasions, and the issue we have to decide to-day is precisely the same as that which has been settled by the divisions which have already taken place on the subject. The only difference is that the case for the promoters has been made very much stronger, and many of the objections which have been raised against the Bill have been disposed of by the alterations which have been made in Committee, all of which alterations tend in the direction of giving a larger measure of control to the Board of Education, and of retaining the inherent jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery. I would only repeat what I have said on previous occasions, that the main purpose and object of this Bill is not to get rid of any reasonable amount of control in regard to fundamental matters, but simply to enable a local and representative board of governors, who are all men of the highest standing, and who have no personal interest to serve, to manage their own property, which includes a very large number of leases, without being hampered and delayed by having to submit every detail of their operations to the approval of the Charity Commissioners or any other outside body. It is not the case that there are no other charitable endowments which are free from the control of the Charity Commissioners. As has already been pointed out, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the schools of Eton and Winchester, were exempted from the operation of the Charitable Trusts Act. It is true that they have since been put under the control of the Board of Agriculture, but that control is nothing like so irksome or inconvenient as that which is exercised by the Charity Commissioners. And there are half a dozen other schools which were expressly exempted from the Endowed Schools Act, which have not to submit to outside control, and which have as full power over their property as these governors would be allowed under this Bill. As has been already shown, their manner of dealing with the property is safeguarded in every way by the right of appeal given to any three members of the board, and there will always be a sufficient number of independent members on the board to exercise that right, as is evidenced by the fact that there will be five representatives of the Universities perfectly independent of the representative governors and the other governors nominated by the City Council. To object to the governors being Birmingham men seems to me to be perfectly incomprehensible. I believe that that is a distinct point in their favour. It must be perfectly clear to anyone who knows Birmingham, that we can always get a sufficient number of men of high standing, intelligence, and integrity to be governors, and to manage the affairs of this foundation without going outside. It has been said by the hon. Gentleman opposite that it is an objection to the Bill that these governors have power to appoint their own auditors; but I would remind the hon. Member that not only have the accounts to be published in the local newspapers, but they must be submitted to the Board of Education for approval. It was said by the hon. Member for Nottingham that conflicting interests might arise between the Board of Governors and the Corporation of the City of Birmingham. Why, the interests of both these bodies are the interests of the people of Birmingham, and both are elected to look after the interests of the people whom they represent, so that both will have the same interests at heart, and there is no likelihood of any conflict taking place between them. My hon. friend the Member for Thirsk referred to the provision which was contained in a former scheme of the Charity Commissioners, requiring that a certain replacement of capital should be made. I am able to inform him, however, that this is fully provided for by the Bill, and that the Bill does not interfere with any arrangement which has been come to in the past. It has been said by several hon. Members that the Bill should not be passed because it would form a bad precedent, and that other schools and charitable bodies will not be slow to follow the example set by the governors of these schools. For my part I consider that, instead of that being a drawback or objection to the Bill, it is a distinct point in its favour. The country as a whole is proverbially rather slow to move, and it frequently requires one of the more robust and energetic portions of it to show the way to the others. And if, as I think, and as seems now to be generally admitted by the majority of the House, this Bill will have the effect of remedying a manifest injustice, or at least a manifest inconvenience, it will form a most useful precedent for endowments in other large towns, and the constitution and powers of other governing bodies of a similar kind will probably in course of time all come to be remodelled, in accordance with the rules of justice and common sense which this Bill lays down. Then it is said that this Bill proposes to make an alteration in the law which should not be brought about by a private Bill, but should be secured by a public Bill. The First Lord of the Treasury, speaking the other day in reference to the Housing of the Working Classes Bill, said that if you want to bring about any great reform or pass any complete and comprehensive measure of legislation, you must proceed by steps and do it piecemeal. If there is one alteration in the law to which that doctrine would apply almost more forcibly than to any other, it is that which is now under consideration. We all know what a large amount of opposition and discussion has been provoked by the very modest proposal to abolish the control of the Charity Commissioners in this one particular case. But what would be the effect if a Bill were introduced to abolish the Charity Commissioners all round? There would be no end to the discussion that it would call forth; every known expedient would be resorted to, to prevent its passing into law, and its promoters might think themselves very fortunate if they got it through in anything under five years. It seems to me, then, that these are essentially cases which, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite has said, should be dealt with separately, each one on its own merits, and not by any general law. You cannot possibly lay down any hard-and-fast rule that can be applied to the case of all charities, because each one differs from the others most materially and in many important particulars; and whilst it might be most unwise to remove the control of the Charity Commissioners in regard to some small endowment in some out-of-the-way country town, it might be the essence of wisdom to do away with their powers in the case of a large charitable endowment situated in one of the chief cities of the kingdom, such as that which we are now dealing with. I submit, then, that if this Bill is passed it will not only be a great benefit to these schools, and very much calculated to promote their future welfare, but that it will also form a most useful precedent. I hope, therefore, that the House will not stultify itself by going back upon its former decisions, as to the desirability of passing it into Law.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): This is a matter of very great importance, not only in itself, but because of the precedent it will set. The crowded condition of the House at this time of business is proof of that. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who is most anxious for this Bill, will not think that those who oppose it desire in any way to charge the promoters of the Bill or the Corporation of Birmingham with being dishonest or incapable, or anything of that kind. If there is one corporation more than another which comes before this House with a good reputation in regard to all matters of local government, that public body is the Corporation of Birmingham. Still, admitting all that, I must urge the importance and value of an independent authority, like the Charity Commissioners, exercising supervision. The powers of the Charity Commissioners, are very large, not merely as regards malversation or dishonesty, or anything of that kind, but against possible mistake and error. Those who have studied the reports quoted by my hon. friend know perfectly well that cases can be shown of trustees acting *bona fide*, but making mistakes. There was the extraordinary case mentioned the other day in the House which occurred in London. A large portion of the very valuable property of Lord's cricket ground was on the point of being sold by the trustees of a certain charity, and they had almost parted with it when the Commissioners intervened, and got £20,000 more for it than the trustees were prepared to accept. May I remind my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham that in the evidence given in regard to this school before the Committee presided over by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, it was stated that the corporation of that city put gentle pressure on the trustees of the school to part with that property, and if the Commissioners had not intervened the corporation would have forced them to part with it under the Artisans' Dwellings Act for much less than they were able to obtain when the matter was gone into in a different way, and the property was exempted from that Act. Nobody on that occasion charged the corporation with being dishonest or stupid. It was a mistake made by business men. Surveyors and valuers fell into the mistake, and it did not in the least reflect on the business capacity of the Corporation of Birmingham. It shows that even an able and intelligent body like a corporation is all the better for having a second opinion, and that it should submit its own proposals to a body independent of all local interests, and able to approach the subject in the manner the Charity Commissioners are able to do. I believe it could be shown that all those cases which have been placed before the House, and which have been called exceptions, are not exceptions at all. They are all schools which have been dealt with by special Acts of Parliament. I may venture to say, in conclusion, that the supporters of the Bill have not really satisfied the public opinion of this House, because they have not had the courage to submit the Bill to a Committee. On the Second Reading they promised a clause which many hon. Members entirely misunderstood, and which my right hon. friend stated then, and stated now, is in reality not worth the paper it is written on.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): There are two quite distinct questions which Members of the House have got to decide before making up their minds in connection with this Bill. The first is the one which the noble Lord addressed himself to—namely, Is the arrangement proposed by this Bill better or worse than that for which this measure is a substitute? In other words, is this great charity likely to be better managed under this governing body than under the restrictions which necessarily and from the nature of the case are now imposed upon it? That is a question on which I venture to say there is very little difference of opinion. Does anyone seriously believe that the new governing body of this great institution will mismanage the property? Nobody doubts that the management will be conducted under far more favourable circumstances than those which at present hamper it. On the merits of the Bill, I say that the change which it is proposed to make will be a very beneficial one. But there is another question on which I venture to say there is a much greater difference of opinion. It is the question not whether this is an improvement as regards King Edward's School, but whether it is right to improve this particular school without also improving other institutions under similar circumstances; in other words, is it proper to deal with this institution by way of an exception, instead of waiting for a general measure freeing all schools at the same time, if they are to be freed, from the control of the Charity Commissioners? It is on that point that I have formed a strong opinion, and I should not have troubled the House had there only been the first of the two points I have referred to. The second point is much wider than the first, and I think I am bound to say a word to the House in regard to it. In the first place, let me point out to the House that there is a great misconception in some quarters—amongst those Members who complain that this is a private Bill introduced by a local authority without any reference to a central authority. That is not the case. The Bill was referred to the new Education Department, and upon it that Department passed judgment and introduced Amendments. The new Education Department are of opinion that the Bill runs on general lines they are prepared to approve of in other cases which resemble this one. Therefore, we are not legislating at random about a single case, but on general educational conditions which have been considered by the central department of the Government which this House has entrusted with the duty. In the next place, I ask myself is it possible to proceed in these matters in the way my right hon. friend and others refer to. They appear to think that we ought never to touch these schools at all, or that we should legislate for the 22,000 important charities which are at present under the Charity Commissioners. It is manifestly impossible, in my judgment, to proceed by a general Act which shall be applicable to 22,000 cases, or half that number, or quarter that number, or even an infinitesimal fraction of that number. Every case must be tried on its merits. I have no doubt that there are, outside Birmingham, other great educational institutions which may be treated, and they probably will be treated, as it is proposed to treat King Edward's School. In those cases the Education Department will apply the same principle which is applied to this Bill. In future, private Bills dealing with those institutions will be submitted to the Education Department, and I have no doubt the House will be prepared to sanction similar measures to that which on this occasion they will sanction for King Edward's School at Birmingham. There is, therefore, no ground for supposing that we are proceeding by way of making an undue exception in this matter, or indeed that it is possible to proceed on such broad lines and such universal lines of general legislation as some hon. Members appear to desire. For my own part, I believe that the consideration of each of these great educational endowments should be on its merits, and that this is the only way which is likely to produce good results. Whether a Bill should be brought in as a public or a private measure seems to me to be a very subordinate matter, of mere technical interest, and under these circumstances I think it would be a most unhappy precedent if on the Third Reading and after the fourth discussion the House should reject the Bill.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): The question at issue is one which goes to the very root of our Parliamentary procedure, namely, whether the restrictions which have been deliberately imposed by Parliament under the general law of the land in the administration of charitable trusts is to be whittled away in piecemeal fashion by successive attempts on the part of local communities to emancipate themselves from those restrictions. I do not wish to say anything disrespectful of Birmingham, which is a very important place, and which for more than a generation has been the laboratory of a number of very interesting municipal experiments. I must say that I have not been convinced by any argument which I have heard from the right hon. Gentleman of the proposition that a law which is good enough for the rest of England and Wales is not good enough for Birmingham. The vista which the right hon. Gentleman held out of the various charitable trusts of the country, or the communities for which those trusts exist, coming forward to this House with a succession of similar proposals to get rid in their particular cases of the responsibility imposed by the general law of the land is something which I cannot contemplate with satisfaction. If it be the case that the safeguards provided by the Charity Commissioners are too rigid and inelastic in their nature to remain, as they have been now for a great many years, part of the general law, that is a difficulty which ought to be dealt with—and can only be properly dealt with—by general legislation. So long as those safeguards have been deliberately imposed by Parliament, so long as nobody contends that a case has been made out for an alteration of the general law, I think that, in the interests of our Parliamentary procedure—and, what is of still more vital importance, in the interests of uniformity of the law with regard to the administration of charitable trusts throughout the country — this House ought to look with suspicion on a measure of this kind. On these grounds I shall be compelled to vote against the Third Reading.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman has laid down a principle which he will find it inconvenient to practise in future, and which I am certain he has not practised in the past. It is that there should be absolutely no exception to the general law of this country. The Charity Commission apply the same restrictions in the case of a great institution dealing with £50,000 a year and 700 leases, and administered in the atmosphere of a great manufacturing and keenly intelligent town, as they apply in the case of some petty village charity. Naturally, great irritation is produced in the case of the great institution by restrictions which are perfectly right and proper for the petty village charity. Let me take as another instance the question of the municipal law of this country. The right hon. Gentleman spoke as if this was the first time on which the House had had the common-sense to deal with various cases on their different merits. Nothing could be more absurd than to put forward a proposal to put all charities on a Procrustean bed, and cut them all according to the same pattern. That is not a precedent which has been followed with regard to municipal corporations. There is not a municipal corporation of any importance which has not special legislation. A Committee was appointed to consider all cases of deviation from the general law on their merits; and since then variations have been permitted in the case of nearly all the great municipalities, according to local circumstances. Surely it is impertinent to come down here to try and frighten the House with the idea that we are now creating a new precedent with regard to charities. I do not remember any private Bill which has been fought with greater persistency than this extremely innocent Bill. And yet, except for the point with which I have just dealt, there is no general public interest involved in the matter. If hon. Members are pleased to suppose that the people of Birmingham are less capable of managing this charity successfully than the Charity Commissioners, who live in London and know nothing of the local circumstances, even then the people of Birmingham would be the only sufferers. There are only three bodies concerned. First, there are the Charity Commissioners, who declare themselves glad to get rid of the charity, though their representatives do not act in that spirit. Their representatives have come down here and said that, having stated their views on the subject, they are perfectly ready to hand over the control. Secondly, there is the Board of Education, which is perfectly ready to take over the charity. Thirdly, there are the people of Birmingham, from which city not a whisper of opposition to the Bill has come, although the Bill has been before the House all this time. The object of the whole people, without exception, is to secure the passage of the Bill. Do hon. Members believe in local self-government or not? It is an extraordinary fact that the persons who in theory express their belief in allowing people to manage their own affairs, whenever it comes to the point insist that other people's affairs should be managed according their liking, and not from the point of view of the people concerned. If the people of Birmingham are fit to be entrusted with an expenditure amounting to something like

£2,000,000 a year, surely they are fit to manage the thousand petty details connected with this charity, in regard to which at present they are put to great inconvenience and trouble by the regulations of the Charity Commissioners. I hope, on that ground alone, and on no other, as a mere matter of consistency, the House will be prepared by a very large majority to allow the people of Birmingham to manage their own affairs.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside) said that many hon. Members of this House desired to extend as much as possible the administrative power of corporations and other local bodies, but what he thought the House ought to be very careful about was giving to the governors of a charity the power to dispose of the corpus of their endowment. He wished to point out that, in consequence of the Charity Commissioners exercising control over the disposal of endowments, many thousands of pounds had been preserved to the charities which would otherwise have been frittered away. He knew of one case where the governors of the charity were prepared to sell some property for £20,000, but by the interference of the Charity Commissioners £40,000 was obtained. In another case £2,500 was the price arranged by the governors of a charity, but by the interference of the Charity Commissioners £8,000 was secured for the endowment. It was because he thought they ought to be very careful with regard to giving such powers that he should oppose the Bill.

The House divided:—Ayes, 170; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 152.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Aird, John
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anstruther, H. T.
Arnold, Alfred
Arrol, Sir William
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Rt. Hn. A. H. S.-(Hunts.)
Beach, Rt. Hn W. W. B. (Hants.
Biddulph, Michael
Bonsor, Henry Cosmo Orme
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brigg, John
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Gl'sg'w
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chelsea, Viscount
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. R. (Hereford)
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. E. T. D.
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dix'n
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Elliott, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gull, Sir Cameron
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hazell, Walter
Helder, Augustus
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Rt. Hn. A. Staveley (Staffs.
Howard, Joseph
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, Sir John Jones
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez Edw.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'ns'a
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Lafone, Alfred
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cum'bl'nd
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Sw'ns'a
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Liverp'l)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macaleese, Daniel
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'gh, W.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, James
Manners, Lord Edward Wm. J.
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Yorks.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murnaghan, George
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdigate, Fras. Alexander
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
Oldroyd, Mark
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randell, David
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Henry Charles
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Robinson, Brooke

Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Rutherford, John
Samuel H. S. (Limehouse)
Savory, Sir Joseph
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sidebettom, William (Derbysh.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Sir H. M. (Lambeth)
Steadman, William Charles
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Edward
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt.-Cl. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams, J. Carvell (Notts)
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wyndham, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Austen Chamberlain and Mr. Lowe.

NOES.

Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. Henry
Baker, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Bartley, George C. T.
Bethell, Commander
Bill, Charles
Billson, Alfred
Blakiston-Houston, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carew, James Laurence
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Courtney, Rt. Hon. L. H.
Crombie, John William
Dunn, Sir William
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Emmott, Alfred
Engledew, Charles John
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flower, Ernest
Fry, Lewis
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gunter, Colonel
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Hardy, Laurence
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Heath, James
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Hobhouse, Henry
Holland, William Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Howell, William Tudor
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U
Kinloch, Sir John George S.
Knowles, Lees
Labouchere, Henry
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cumb'land
Maclean, James Mackenzie
M'Crae, George
M'Ewan, William
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Mather, William
Monckton, Edward Philip
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarth'n
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Montrose)
Morrison, Walter
Myers, William Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herbert Pike (D'rlington
Penn, John
Pilkington, Sir Geo A (Lancs SW
Pretyman, Ernest George
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Pym, C. Guy
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Cheltenham
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Stanhope, Hon Philip J.
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stock, James Henry
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'd
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (Govan)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Bond and Mr. Joseph A. Pease.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That so much of Standing Order 91 as fixes Five as the quorum of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be read, and suspended.

Ordered, That for the remainder of the session Three be the quorum of the Committee.—(*Mr. Halsey.*)

GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) BILL.

Reported, without amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time on Monday next.

LONDON (POPLAR) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

LONDON (CLERKENWELL AND HOLBORN) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

BREWERY AND COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT TRUST BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL (BRIDGES) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

SCOTTISH AMERICAN INVESTMENT COMPANY, LIMITED, BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

FALKIRK CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MILFORD DOCKS BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE COMPANY BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

SOUTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords.]

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

TAFF VALE RAILWAY BILL [Lords]

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RHYMNEY RAILWAY BILL [Lords.]

CORK ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords.]

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

BRISTOL WATER BILL [Lords.]

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time.

WHITECHAPEL AND BOW RAILWAY BILL [Lords.]

WIRRAL RAILWAY BILL [Lords.]

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords.]

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

BRAY AND ENNISKERRY RAILWAY BILL.

TOTTENHAM URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill, without Amendment.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Dorking Water Bill [Lords], Fishguard Water and Gas Bill [Lords], Menstone Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords], Newport Corporation Bill [Lords], Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Great Grimsby Street Tramways Company with respect to the construction and working of Tramways in the borough of Grimsby and for other purposes." Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer upon the Corporation of Ramsgate further powers with reference to the local government and improvement of the borough; and for other purposes." Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the North British Railway Company to construct certain new railways, widenings, and other works; to confer further powers upon the Company and upon other Companies in connection with their respective undertakings; to amalgamate the Aberlady, Gullane, and North Berwick Railway Company, the Newport Railway Company, and the Eyemouth Railway Company with the Company; to transfer to and vest in the Company the undertaking of the Borrowstounness Harbour Commissioners; to enable the Burntisland Harbour Commissioners to borrow and the Company to advance them further money; to authorise the Company to enter into working and other agreements with the Invergarry and Fort Augustus Railway Company; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes." North British Railway Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to empower the Corporation of Walsall to construct tramways; to extend their powers in regard to their gas undertaking; to make further provision in regard to financial matters; and for the improvement of the borough; and for other purposes." Walsall Corporation Bill [Lords].

Public Accounts.—That they give leave to the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend in order to his being examined as a witness before the Select Committee appointed by this House on "Public Accounts."

GREAT GRIMSBY STREET TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

RAMSGATE CORPORATION IMPROVEMENTS BILL [Lords].

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

WALSALL CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Paisley, against; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Petition from Walworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

LAND REGISTRY (NEW BUILDINGS) BILL.

Petition from Lee, against; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Bromley, and Beckenham; to lie upon the Table.

LONDON BOROUGH COUNCILS (WOMEN'S DISABILITIES REMOVAL) BILL.

Petition from St. Mary, Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PETTY CUSTOMS ABOLITION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dumfries, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petition from Bournemouth, against establishment; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Uckfield; Burgess Hill; Eastbourne (two); Brighton (two); Bradford; Newhaven; Newburn; Deal; Lymington; Gosport;

Luton; Henley-on-Thames; Ashington; Greenhead; Hexham; Horsham (two); Newbiggin-by-the-Sea; and Birkenhead; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against, from East Berks; and Loughborough; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Portsmouth; Tunbridge Wells; Southport (nine); Dover (two); Northampton; Dowlais (thirteen); Croydon (four); Herne Bay; Camberwell (two); Elham; Snainton; Sherburn; East Ayton; Brampton; Scarborough (five); Seamar; Crosby; Southmolton (two); New Tredegar; Wath; Burgess Hill; Littlehampton; Llanelly (twenty-three); Birkdale; Crossens; Stockport; Pudsey; Padiham; Hackney; Clapham Road; Trawden; South St. Pancras (seven); Ainsdale; Earlestown; Liverpool; Waterloo (two); Aymestry; Leintwardine; Adley Moor; Wigmore; Hayle; Forest of Dean; St. Clether; Week; St. Mary; Tresmeer; Boyton; Altarnon; St. Gennys; Warbstow; Watford; Harrogate; Brighton (three); Tresparrett; Maxworthy; Treneglos; Poundstock; Jacobstow; Bury; Luckwell Bridge; Wood Green; Bicester; Tyersal; Edmonton; Norwich; Measham; Weston-super-Mare; Sevenoaks; Southampton (four); Redruth; St. Breward; Copthorne; Launceston; Stratton; St. Michaels; Darwen; Smethwick (two); Handsworth (three); Whittle Brook; Patricroft (two); Flixton; Little Hulton; Eccles (two); Swinton; Pendlebury; Birmingham (two); Burnley (six); Mereclough; Calverley; Pudsey; Nomansland; Widnes (three); Lymington (two); Fordingbridge (two); Seagrave; Saint Helens (two); Sutton Oak; Bishop Waltham; Ponder's End; Garston; St. Asaph; Mossley Hill; Old Kent Road; Wandsworth; Balham Grove; Shortlands; Bromley (two); Sheffield (five); Witham; Whiston; Maldon; High Barnet; Bute; Braintree; Loughton (five); Peterborough (two); Langstone; Wootton-under-Edge (two); Charfield; Gosport; Gloucester; Burnham; Shipham; Beaufort; Cwm; Victoria; Porthcawl; Seaforth; Kennington; Islington; Weston-super-Mare; Aberystwyth; Battersby Junction; Eye; York; Adisham; Shoreham; Portslade; Southern Cross; Wisbech (two); Bolney; Newburn; Scotswood; South Norwood (two); Walbottle; Saltburn; Sengdale; Newby; Stokesley; Darnall, Bedford College; Atherton (two); New Brompton; Pudsey (two); Southminster; Leigh; Sparkbrook; Small Heath; Carne Abbas; Lyme Regis; Bowbridge; Middle Hulton; Farnworth; Wibsey; Idle (six); Thackley; Eccleshill (two); Heston; Tyldesley (two); Lancaster; Grange-over-Sands; Barking; Southend-on-Sea (three); Ashton-on-Ribble; Whittlesea; Downham Market; Brigg (six); Dovercourt; New Wandsworth; Middleham; Middlesbrough; Ferry Hill; Eastbourne (six); Burgess Hill; Blechington; Stanton St. John; Oxford (three); Cassington (two); Long Handborough; Bladon; Ebbes; Brades; Newhaven; Bolsover; Woodford; Elm; Leeds; Widnes; Glossop; Buxton (three); North-West Derbyshire; Whitton; Isleworth; Copthorne; Hayward's Heath; Uckfield; Broughty Ferry; Brighton (two); Tyldesley; Islington (five); Hillmarton; Goatacre; Market Rasen; Binbrook; Aylsham; London; East Bristol (two); Eastwood; Tickhill; Bingley; Bristol (thirteen); Garras Mawyan; Warrington; Gulfach; Paignton; Stockport; Newbiggin-by-the-Sea; Deal; Kingswood (two); Lidgate; Wickhambrook; West Hartlepool (two); Hartlepool; Glasgow; Eltham; Wimbledon; Southampton; Calne; Chippenham; Cwm-y-gaist; Huddersfield; Tisbury; Ely; Mostyn; Chedworth; Melksham; Gosberton; Bradford-on-Avon; Cowes; Seaforth; Whiteparish; Wadhurst; Sudbury; Longwood; Ryburgh; Puddington; Witheridge; Griffithstown (two); Ashington; Dulwich (two); Penge; Purley; Horsham (three); Crawley (two); Liskeard; Oldbury; Terrington; Swansea (three); Cawston; Itteringham; Louth; Langworth; Berkhampstead; Oswersby; Wood Green; Keighley (six); Greenhead; Hexham (two); Slaley; Hemel Hempstead; South Manchester; Cross Hills; Wells next the Sea; Tottenham; Thornton; Sutton-in-Craven; Bexhill; Ealing Dean; West Coanwood; Allendale Town; Kentish Town, N.W.; Burgess Hill (two); Manchester; Stockport; Oakham; Knaresborough; Hibaldstow; Westwood; St. Silas; Aston (six); Birmingham (two); Bedminster (three); Sudbury; Cleckheaton; Nottingham; Forest Hill; Widnes; Luddendenfoot; Henham; Saffron Walden; Walsingham; Holbeach (six); Fleet Fen; Whaplode Drove; Barwell; Earl Shilton; Hinckley; Brampton; Wickmere; Hamworth; Alborough; Cowling Hill; Old Cleeve; Broomfield; and Timberscombe; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (NO. 2) BILL AND SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petition from Sheffield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Glasgow; Elgin; Dyce; and Dundee; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Burgess Hill (two); Birkdale; Southport (nine); Earlestown; Waterloo (two); Crosby; Aymestry; Llanelly (twenty-three); Hastings (two); Truro; Tresillian; Merthyr; Penweathers; Lydney; Old Cleeve; Bury (two); Walton-on-Thames; Luckwell Bridge; Timberscombe; Redruth; Delabole; Copthorne; St. Breward; Launceston (three); Maxworthy; Warbstow; Trespanett; Treneglos; Poundstock; Jacobstow; Cold Northcott; Week St. Mary; Boyton; Tresmeer; Stratton; Saint Gennys; Pudsey; Smethwick (three); Handsworth; Patricroft (two); Swinton; Whittle Brook; Flixton; Little Hulton; Birmingham (two); Stockport; Burnley (five); Pendlebury; Mereclough; Odley Moor; Fulledge; Nomansland; Seagrave; Southampton; Sutton Oak; St. Helens; Ponders End; Widnes (six); Oxford; Mossley Hill; Balham Grove; Bicester; Brighton (three); Altarnon; Norfolk (two); Tyersal; Sheffield (two); Maldon; Sevenoaks; Measham; Stebbing; Loughton; Longstone; Hambledon; Gosport; Manchester (six); Lutton; Rhymney; Ebbw Vale (two); New Tredegar; Waunllwyd; Beaufort; Cwm; Aberystwyth; Glyncorwg; Moreton-in-Marsh; Porthcawl; Dowlais (fifteen); Forest of Dean; Timberscombe; Launceston; Darnall; Pudsey (two); Sparkbrook; Small Heath; Cerne Abbas; Bowbridge; Lyme Regis; Middle Hulton; Farnworth; Atherton (two); Barling; Whittlesea (two); Lessingham; Tyldesley; Norwich; Brigg (six); Middleham; Ferry Hill; Southend-on-Sea (two); Middlesbrough (three); North Ormesby (two); Eastbourne (five); Newhaven (two); Brades; South Norwood (two); Croydon; Newburn; Stoneham; Wisbech; Friday Bridge; Sherburn; Seamer (two); Brompton; East Ayton; Snainton; Scarborough (three); Sugdale; Saltburn; Stokesley; Walbottle; Newby; Battersby; Herne Bay; Dover; South Molton; Uckfield; East Northants; Buxton (two); Elm; Glossop; Walthamstow; Garston; St. Helens; Aston; Horsham; Micheldever; Cleckheaton; Swansea; Cawston; Itteringham; Thornton; Aylsham; Walsingham; Whaplode Drove; Holbeach; Hinckley; Barwell; Brompton; Alborough; Bideford; Sunderland; Market Rasen; Langworth; Hemel Hempstead; Wood Green; Heallys; Keighley (three); Cross Hills; Glasgow; Hanworth; Belper; Owersby; Abercarne; Tottenham; Wickmere; Sudbury; Garras Mawgan; Binbrook; Abbotsham; Greenhead; Paignton; Allendale; Hexham-on-Tyne; Gorleston; Warrington; Witheridge; Great Ryburgh; Paddington; Gelligaer; Sabden; Openshaw; West Hartlepool (two); Hartlepool; Eltham; Seaforth; Purley; East Dulwich; Motherwell; St. Cleer; Polruan; Newbiggin by the Sea; Holbeach (three); West Coanwood; St. Silas; Aston (two); Aston Park; and Lymington; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Southport; Newton Nottage; Gelligaer; Newcastle; Emlyn; and Raglan; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 21st June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 227.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 21st June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 228.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 TO 1890 (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Applications to and Proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1890, during the past year [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 229.]

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th June; *Sir John William Maclure*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 230.]

EAST INDIA RAILWAYS (PURCHASE).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 18th June; *Mr. Cohen*]; to lie upon the Table.

BEDFORDSHIRE REGIMENT (RECRUITS, ETC.).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th May; *Mr. Hudson*]; to lie upon the Table.

LEAD POISONING.

Address for "Return giving (a) the number of cases of Lead Poisoning reported under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1895, in the manufacture of earthenware and china during the period from the 1st day of January, 1899, to the 31st day of May, 1900, distinguishing between cases in the decorative processes and cases in the processes of dipping, ware cleaning, etc.; (b) the number of persons suspended from working in dangerous processes by the certifying surgeons for the Hanley, Burslem, Tunstall, and Stoke districts in the same manufacture during the same period, in pursuance of the special rules."—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PROPOSED VISIT OF COLONIAL CONTINGENTS TO THE MOTHER COUNTRY.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, when the services of the troops raised by Canada, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, Ceylon, Cape Colony, and Natal for South Africa can be dispensed with by Lord Roberts, he will endeavour to facilitate the visit to the Mother Country of representatives of those contingents.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The proposal has been for some time under consideration, and the Secretary of State has consulted Lord Roberts on the subject.

RELEASED BRITISH PRISONERS.

MR. PALMER (Reading): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War when he will be able to publish for the information of their friends the names of all officers and men who were taken prisoners during the war in South Africa and have now been released by the action of Lord Roberts.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The names of the officers were published on Tuesday, the 19th inst. The names of the men have not yet been reported by Lord Roberts.

PROMOTIONS FROM THE RANKS.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Oldham): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state what is the number of men during the past six months promoted from the ranks of the regular forces at present serving in South Africa; and how many of these are infantry, mounted infantry, cavalry, artillery, or engineers.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The numbers are as follow:—Cavalry, 3; artillery, 4; engineers, 1; infantry, 30; total, 38. The returns sent to the War Office do not distinguish mounted infantry from infantry.

RETURN OF RESERVISTS FROM SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Hertfordshire, Hertford): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, since the employers of many skilled artisans who are Reservists now in South Africa are keeping their situations open for them, any assurance can be given that Reservists who desire to return to their avocations will be among the first soldiers to be sent home on the conclusion of hostilities, even if they should happen to belong to regiments to be ultimately employed in the army of occupation.

*MR. WYNDHAM: It would be premature to give any such assurance at the present time, but full consideration will be given to the suggestion, not only for the sake of the men, but of the employers who have acted in so patriotic a manner.

SETTLEMENT OF SOLDIERS IN SOUTH AFRICA AFTER THE WAR.

MR. EVELYN CECIL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, as many Reservists now serving in South Africa are skilled artisans, careful attention will be given to their case in considering the question of offering inducements to soldiers to settle in South Africa after the war.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The whole question of grants to soldiers willing to settle in South Africa after the war has been referred to an Interdepartmental Committee.

PENSIONS FOR ARMY NURSING SISTERS.

MR. BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the scale of pensions given to members of the Army Nursing Service, under which the highest pension that an army nursing sister can receive is £37 a year after twenty-one years service, and that she cannot receive more even if she continues to work till she is sixty years of age, and that the average pension is less than this; and whether, in view of the work done by the members of the service, especially during the war in South Africa, pensions on a more liberal scale could be provided.

*MR. WYNDHAM: An army nursing sister receives a pension of £26 a year after twenty-one years service and £35 after 30 years service; but in any case of "special devotion to her duties" or on being appointed superintendent a higher rate, up to a maximum of £50, may be granted. It is not thought necessary to increase these rates.

RESERVISTS' PENSIONS.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he is now in a position to state whether, in the case of the Reservists in Section D who have been called up for active service in South Africa, the whole time of their service in Sections A, B, C, or D counts for pensions; and, if so, whether they will be given an opportunity of re-engaging to complete twenty-one years service for pensions.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Time in the Reserve counts for pension if the Reservist is permitted to re-engage to complete twenty-one years with the colours. It is not the intention of the Government to give any general permission to Reservists to re-engage, because such a measure, besides being very expensive, would deplete the Reserve, which it is the policy of the Government to enlarge. But a certain number of the Reservists will probably be allowed to re-engage after the war is over.

VOLUNTEER MOUNTED INFANTRY GRANT.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): On behalf of the Member for Hastings, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what grant the Government proposes to give towards the expenses of Volunteer mounted infantry beyond the ordinary grant to Volunteers.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I am not in a position to answer that at present.

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT FATALITIES.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he will lay upon the table of the House the report of the inquiry to be made into the causes of the recent disaster at Aldershot.

MAJOR RASCH: At the same time may I ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the Government have any objection to laying the Report of the Court of Inquiry on the casualties at Aldershot on Monday, 11th June, upon the Table of the House.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Perhaps the hon. and gallant Member for South-east Essex will allow me to answer at the same time the question which he has addressed to the First Lord. The inquiry, which has not been made by a

Court, but by the Adjutant-General, has established all the facts, no one of which is in dispute, or even in doubt. There is no objection to publishing the facts in greater detail than has already been given to the House. In respect of the omission to order that helmets should be worn by all men provided with them the Commander-in-Chief considers that the action which he has taken meets the requirements of the case. In respect of failure in the supply of light refreshments to two battalions, and of the number and duration of halts on the march back to camp, the Adjutant-General is inquiring into the action taken by individual officers commanding battalions, and the Commander-in-Chief will administer such reprimands or cautions as each case may demand.

8TH HUSSARS—OFFICERS ON SPECIAL DUTY.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Major and Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel Le Gallais, and Major and Brevet Colonel Mahon, 8th Hussars, have been employed on special duties away from their regiment, the former for about six years, the latter for about ten years, without being seconded, so that none have been promoted or appointed to do their regimental work; and whether he can see his way to a rule being made that whenever an officer is employed away from his regiment for more than twelve months continuously he shall be made supernumerary in his regiment, in order that those doing his regimental work may have due rank, and the complement of officers doing duty with the regiment be kept complete.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Majors employed extra-regimentally are replaced by captains, who carry out the necessary regimental work.

In reply to a further question by Colonel WELBY,

*MR. WYNDHAM said additional captains were appointed to do the work, but not additional majors.

PROMOTIONS OF SECOND LIEUTENANTS OF ARTILLERY AND ENGINEERS.

MR. NEWDIGATE (Warwickshire, Nuneaton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Secretary of State for War has now come to a decision as to whether second lieutenants of Artillery and Engineers should be put on an equal footing as regards promotion with second lieutenants of cavalry and infantry.

*MR. WYNDHAM: This question is still under consideration.

MILITIA OFFICERS' PAY.

MR. BOSCAWEN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that the officers of embodied Militia are placed on exactly the same footing as Line battalions, so far as duties and pay are concerned during embodiment, and that in consequence the senior major of a Militia battalion, though not formally appointed second in command, has the same duties to perform as the second in command of a Line battalion, whether he ought not to receive the additional pay, over and above a major's pay, which is given to the seconds in command of Line battalions.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The question is under consideration.

MILITIA COMMISSIONS.

MR. BOSCAWEN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that subalterns of Militia, who joined the force in order to obtain commissions in the Line, are unable to obtain them during embodiment, because their services are required with their Militia units, while at the same time a number of commissions are being given to the universities and public schools, to boys who have never done any soldiering, but who will now become their seniors in the Army; and whether the commissions given to Militia subalterns at the end of embodiment can be ante-dated, so that they shall not lose seniority through service in the Militia.

*MR. WYNDHAM: My hon. friend is under an entire misapprehension. The majority of the commissions given to Militia officers recently have been granted to officers while serving in embodied regiments and bear date prior to those given to the university candidates, who, it should be remembered, are all over twenty years of age. No commissions have as yet been given to any public school boys.

MR. BOSCAWEN: I want to know not what has been done, but what is going to be done with reference to those subalterns now serving in the Militia, in many cases abroad, who are unable to come home and prepare for examination, and in many cases may not be able to compete at all.

*MR. WYNDHAM: That is not the question on the Paper. It deals with embodied subalterns. But I hope in a very few days to publicly announce a modification of the conditions of examination on the lines laid down by the Member for South-East Essex, namely, a proportionate number of marks for service of embodiment.

MR. BOSCAWEN: And may I ask that the announcement may be made as soon as possible, in view of the great interest taken in this subject?

*MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member need not ask that. The scheme is being worked at two or three hours daily.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT—PRESENT POSITION AT PEKING, TIENTSIN, ETC.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information from China to the effect that the Foreign Legations at Peking are safe; and whether there is any further news from Tientsin or from the expeditionary force.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): We have no news from Peking, or from the expeditionary forces. A runner from Tientsin, 18th June, arriving at Ta-ku yesterday, gave information of the situation at Tientsin that several attacks had been made and repulsed. On 17th Chinese shelled foreign settlement. The Chinese Military College was then attacked by a mixed force of 175 Austrians, British, Germans, and Italians, who destroyed the guns, burnt the college with considerable store of ammunition, and killed the defenders. The Russians with their four heavy field guns did excellent service. The British loss was 1 killed, 5 wounded; the Germans, 1 killed; the Italians, 2 wounded; the Russians, 7 killed, 5 wounded. Chinese during night of 17th tried to seize bridge of boats, but were repulsed with loss, including, it is reported, a Chinese General. The Rear-Admiral at Ta-ku telegraphs last night that information has been received from Tientsin by runner up to 20th June, to the effect that fighting was going on, and that reinforcements were required. We have heard further by telegram from the Rear-Admiral, dated Ta-ku, last night, Chefoo this morning, as follows—

> "I am hoping that Tientsin may be relieved to-night, 21st June. No news from Commander-in-Chief. Her Majesty's ship "Terrible" landed this morning 382 officers and men of the 2nd Battalion Royal Welsh Fusiliers and Royal Engineers."

It is believed that various other bodies of troops will arrive within a day or two, if, indeed, they have not arrived already. Arrangements have been made by Her Majesty's Government to supplement very considerably the force already placed under orders for China.

BRITISH FORCES ON THE CHINA STATION.

SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state approximately the strength and composition of the British force on shore under the command of the Admiral Commanding-in-Chief on the China station; whether this force is composed of units drawn from Her Majesty's ships on the station, and whether the ships from which these units are withdrawn are complete in every respect in fighting efficiency; what proportion does the strength of force on shore bear to the aggregate number of combatants borne by the ships from which the force on shore has been drawn; and whether, on that distant station, any supplementary force to the complements of the ships is placed at Hong Kong or elsewhere at the disposal and under the control of the Admiral, to enable him to provide for minor military operations and contingencies without detriment to the complete fighting efficiency of his fleet.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.): My right hon. friend is unavoidably absent, but he wishes me to give his reply as follows:—"We have no information as to the composition of the British force on shore under the command of Admiral Seymour, and I am thus prevented from answering the questions on that point; but no doubt large numbers cannot be landed from ships without diminishing their fighting efficiency. The answer to the last question is in the negative, but, of course, the hon. and gallant Gentleman will remember that there are troops at Hong Kong who cooperate with the naval authorities when the necessity arises."

SIR J. COLOMB: But they cannot fill up the vacancies on the ships. How do the Admiralty propose to replace the men taken away by Admiral Seymour?

MR. MACARTNEY: I must ask for notice.

THE PRESS AND FOREIGN OFFICE PAPERS.

*MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will he explain why advance copies of printed Papers issued by the Foreign Office are not presented to the *Morning Leader* in the same way as they are given to other daily papers; how many newspapers that support the South African policy of the Government receive these Papers, and how many papers that oppose that policy are similarly privileged, and whether the printed Papers are supplied by the Foreign Office at the public expense; and how many sets of Papers are so distributed, and among what papers.

*MR. BRODRICK: Only a limited list of newspapers receive advance copies of printed Papers issued by the Foreign Office, and the number of newspapers gratuitously supplied could not be increased without opening the door widely. Twenty-one press agencies and newspapers are supplied by the Foreign Office at the public expense—namely, *Central News*, *Central Press*, *Daily Chronicle*, *Daily Graphic*, *Daily Mail*, *Daily News*, *Daily Telegraph*, *Echo*, Exchange Telegraph Company, *Globe*, *London and China Telegraph*, *Money Market Review*, *Morning Advertiser*, *Morning Post*, National Press Agency, *Observer*, *Pall Mall Gazette*, Press Association, *Standard*, *Times*, Reuter's Telegram Company. There is no information at the Foreign Office as to the views of these agencies and journals upon the South African policy of Her Majesty's Government.

*MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that all these papers support the South African policy of the Government?

[No answer was returned.]

OUTRAGE ON A BURMESE WOMAN AT RANGOON—THE WEST KENT REGIMENT.

SIR LEWIS M'IVER (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state the names and rank of the officials in the several departments who have been held to share in the responsibility for the failure of justice in the case of the West Kent Regiment at Rangoon, and in what form in each instance has the Government of India marked its disapproval.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Government of India have given a most careful and thorough consideration to this matter, and their reports and conclusions have been reviewed by myself and by the Secretary of State for War. A certain number of officers, both civil and military, have been censured or otherwise punished for their part in the proceedings; but it has not been thought desirable, except in a few cases, to publish the decisions which have been arrived at; and I am therefore unable to give my hon. friend the information for which he asks.

INDIAN BUDGET.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the continuance of the condition of affairs in India arising out of the famine, and in view of the desirability that a convenient opportunity should be given to the House to discuss questions of vital interest to the people of India under the present circumstances, he will arrange to take the Indian Budget at an earlier date this session than is usually the case.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have already answered the question. I cannot give the hon. Gentleman any promise of better treatment until I see what course public business takes. If an opportunity for earlier discussion really arises, especially in the special circumstances, I should be glad to meet the wish of the hon. Gentleman.

REPORT OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF FACTORIES.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can now state when the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops will be in the hands of Members; and, when the copy was sent to the printer from the Home Office, and what was the date at which the last proofs were passed for press.

I have also to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can explain how it comes that the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops was only presented on Wednesday afternoon.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hanbury, Preston): The Report is promised by Tuesday, the 3rd of July. All the manuscript of the tables was in the printers' hands by the 12th of April, and all the manuscript of the text by the 15th of May. The final alterations and corrections in the Lady Inspector's Report—which was the latest portion—were received by the printers last Wednesday morning. A final proof has been promised by to-morrow.

W.C.D.O. AUXILIARY POSTMEN AND THE TWEEDMOUTH REPORT.

Mr. STEADMAN (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will explain why six auxiliary postmen working at the W.C.D. Office are refused the benefits recommended by the Tweedmouth Committee to be granted to all auxiliaries working five hours and upwards, although they are doing exactly the same duty as others who are in receipt of these benefits; and will he, in pursuance of the promise given by him, see that this grievance is at once redressed.

Mr. HANBURY: The Tweedmouth Committee recommended that auxiliaries who were employed at the date of their Report in 1897 on duties occupying five hours a day and upwards should be allowed annual and sick leave and a boot allowance; but this was not to apply to future entrants. The auxiliaries to whom the hon. Member refers were employed last year in exceptional circumstances, when it was found that the supply of ex-soldiers or sailors and of telegraph messengers for employment as assistant postmen on short-time postmen's duties occupying four hours a day and upwards was insufficient. These auxiliaries are paid at a higher rate than assistant postmen, but on the understanding that they have no claim to the privileges of annual or sick leave, boot allowances, pension or gratuity.

LONDON TELEGRAPH SERVICE—TEA RELIEFS.

Mr. STEADMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that counter-clerks and telegraphists employed at the Eastern District Post Office and the Aldgate branch office are compelled to serve at the public counter during tea time, the Postmaster General will take steps to provide them with relief during this period in the interests of the staff and the public.

Mr. HANBURY: The counter-clerks and telegraphists at the offices in question—as at other offices in London—are allowed half an hour for refreshments in the middle of the day, during an attendance of eight hours, but they are not entitled to a second interval for tea. No objection, however, is raised to their partaking of tea when on duty, or of leaving the counter for this purpose when the state of the duty permits, which generally happens, as counter work slackens down late in the day. The Postmaster General is not prepared to concede to counter-clerks and telegraphists the right to two intervals for meals in a normal attendance of eight hours.

CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE—DINNER INTERVALS.

Mr. STEADMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the staff in the cable room of the Central Telegraph Office, London, are being punished for taking thirty-one and thirty-two minutes for dinner, this relief time being the only one permitted when on duty from 10 a.m. to 8 p.m.; and that it frequently happens that one-half of the time is occupied in being served at the refreshment rooms, owing to the arrangements of that branch; and whether the Postmaster General will give instructions that the clerks are to be allowed a reasonable time for dining purposes.

MR. HANBURY: No officer has been punished for exceeding his dinner time—thirty minutes—by one or two minutes. When, however, the excess has been three minutes and upwards the offender has been cautioned, and frequent repetitions of these excesses have very properly been punished by the infliction of extra duty. No relief from the instrument galleries for purposes of refreshment other than the thirty minutes for dinner time is given, but to all on duty later than 5 p.m. tea is served and partaken of by the telegraphists at their circuits. Some little delay in serving dinner is unavoidable at times, but such delay as fifteen minutes rarely occurs, and when the late return of a telegraphist is proved to have arisen from causes over which he had no control the excess time is of course excused. The Postmaster General does not consider that any fresh rule on this subject is necessary.

MR. STEADMAN: Does the right hon. Gentleman think that thirty minutes is sufficient for a man to leave the instrument room, get his dinner, and come back again?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

LONDON DOCKS ROYAL COMMISSION.

MR. ALBAN GIBBS (London): Can the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade now state the constitution and terms of reference to the Docks Commission?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The terms of reference of the Royal Commission on the London dock question are as follows—

> "To inquire into the present administration of the Port of London and the water approaches thereto; the adequacy of the accommodation provided for vessels and the loading and unloading thereof; the system of charge for such accommodation and the arrangements for warehousing dutiable goods; and to report whether any change or improvement in regard to any of the above matters is necessary for the promotion of the trade of the port and the public interest."

The list of members contains the names of Earl Egerton of Tatton, who was chairman of the Royal Commission on the Education of the Blind, Deaf, etc., 1884, and chairman of the Manchester Ship Canal, 1887-94; Lord Revelstoke, who is a director of the Bank of England and partner in Baring's; Sir Robert Giffen, late Comptroller-General of the Commercial, Labour, and Statistical Department of the Board of Trade; Rear-Admiral Sir John Hext, who is Director of Marine under the Government of India and was a member of the Bombay Port Trust, 1883-98; the Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, Q.C., M.P.; Mr. John E. Ellis, M.P., a coalowner; and Sir J. Wolfe-Barry, consulting engineer, Past President of the Institution of Civil Engineers.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REPORT.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he can say when the Report of the Education Department for the past year will be presented to Parliament; and whether in future years the former practice of presenting the Report before the Education Estimates were discussed will be adopted.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I am at present unable to say when the Report of the Education Department will be presented. It is a mistake to suppose that in former years the Report was presented before the Estimates were discussed. The statistics have in recent years been so presented and were presented this year.

MOTOR CARS—SPEED REGULATIONS.

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that throughout the country there are complaints of motor-cars being driven at excessive speed and without due care for the safety of the public, and that the difficulty of identification prevents many of the offenders being prosecuted; and whether he will consider the advisability of every motor-car being compelled to carry a distinctive number of such size and so placed as to render identification easy.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): Some representations have been made to the Local Government Board with regard to this matter, and the whole subject, including the suggestion referred to in the second paragraph of the question, is receiving their consideration.

IRISH SCHOOLS—RESULTS FEES.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that teachers whose schools were examined in April last and subsequently for results fees have not yet received payment (although the Board's rules state that they will pay the results fees in the month following that in which the examination is held), and can he say what is the cause of delay and when payment will be made.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central): As I stated yesterday, results fees, as such, are not payable after the 1st April, 1900, but teachers who taught under the results system up to the end of the last financial year will receive an equivalent for such fees based on the average payments for the last three years. The date of payment will depend upon the date of the usual termination of the results period in each school.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE—ANDREW ALLEN'S HOLDING.

Mr. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Andrew Allen, Cabragh, Irvinestown, entered into an agreement with his landlord on 16th June, 1897, to purchase his holding for £335, the provision being made that, instead of rent, interest on price was to be paid to the Land Commission pending completion of purchase, and that this arrangement ended on 1st May, 1899, as from this date he held subject to an annuity payable in half-yearly instalments of £6 14s.; whether he is aware that, because Allen owed one half-year's instalment of £6 14s., namely, from May to November, 1899, the holding was sold 14th March, 1900, not on the land or convenient thereto, but at a distance, in the town of Irvinestown, and that, notwithstanding the sale, the Land Commission accepted from Allen, on 25th April, 1900, payment of the half-year's annuity to November, 1899, and of the half-year's annuity to May, 1900, and in return sent him a receivable order, leading Allen to believe that the sale had been annulled; and will he state if, after accepting the half-year's annuity, delay in payment of which brought about the sale, the Land Commission is going to compel this man to submit to the sale for a nominal sum of his farm, worth several hundred pounds.

Mr. G. W. BALFOUR: Mr. Allen entered into the agreement to purchase on the 16th June, 1897, and thereupon, pursuant to the provisions of the Land Act of 1896, he became liable for payment of interest on the purchase money pending the completion of the sale on the 24th April, 1899. It was necessary during the interval to recover the interest by legal process. The first instalment of the annuity became due on the 1st November, 1899, and, not being paid, proceedings were commenced for the recovery of the instalment and arrears of interest. Subsequently, after due advertisement and full notice to Mr. Allen, the holding was sold by public auction in March last at Irvinestown, which is distant only three miles from the holding. The arrears of interest and of the annuity were paid out of the purchase money, and not by Allen, as stated. A cheque for £7 19s. 8d. was received through the sheriff on account of the decree some days after the sale, and was returned to Allen, by whom it was cashed. It is now alleged that after the completion of the sale he lodged the instalment due on the 1st May last through a local bank. The payment so made, if it is shown to have been made by Allen, will be returned to him on application to the Land Commission. The proceedings for the sale to the new purchaser are now completed.

Mr. MURNAGHAN: But is it not the fact that a receivable order was sent to him with respect of the half-yearly instalment due the 1st May next?

Mr. G. W. BALFOUR: The receivable order on which Allen lodged the instalment due on 1st May, 1900, had been issued to him previous to the sale, and before the instalment due 1st November, 1899. The holding was sold to the new purchaser for £40.

CROWN ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

Mr. GEDGE (Walsall): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the resolution passed by this

House on the 11th April, 1899,* and of the fact that since that day thirteen clergymen have received ecclesiastical preferment in the gift of the Crown who were members either of the English Church Union or of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, or of both, the Minister who recommended the respective appointments satisfied himself, in accordance with the said resolution, that the clergymen in question would obey the law as declared by the Courts which have jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman has been good enough to supply me with the names of the gentlemen he refers to. Of these I find he holds me responsible for four. As a matter of fact, I am only responsible for three. The fourth was not a Crown appointment. With regard to these three, one appointment was made before the resolution was passed, another was not an appointment at all, but the result of an exchange, and the remaining one was in respect of a poor living which had lapsed to the Crown because it could not be filled, and had been unoccupied for some years before the appointment was made. These gentlemen who have been appointed have all given a formal promise to obey their Bishop.

Mr. GEDGE: If I may be allowed to say so, the answer the right hon. Gentleman has given, so far as it affects himself, is quite satisfactory. The remaining appointments to which the question referred were made by the Lord Chancellor, as to whom the right hon. Gentleman can, no doubt, give similar information.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not made inquiries of my noble and learned friend, and I think it would be more convenient if a question were put to him in the other House.

CELTIC ANTIQUITIES IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

Sir HENRY HOWORTH (Salford, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will place upon the Table of the House the correspondence between the Government and the trustees of the British Museum in reference to the proposed removal of Celtic antiquities from the British Museum; also whether he will postpone further proceedings in respect to the transference of Celtic antiquities from the British Museum to Dublin until the House of Commons has had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject.

The following questions on the same subject likewise appeared on the Paper:—

Mr. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the announcement that the Government intend to take legal proceedings against the trustees of the British Museum with the object of obtaining possession of certain Celtic antiquities, and of the importance of exercising impartially the Royal Prerogative of the Crown with respect to treasure trove, he will cause an investigation to be made into the title of the trustees of the Royal Irish Academy in Dublin in respect of similar Celtic antiquities in their custody.

Mr. STANLEY LEIGHTON: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will include in the Papers promised to be laid upon the Table, in reference to the correspondence of the Treasury with the Trustees of the British Museum, a copy of the regulations or minutes issued by the Treasury in respect to treasure trove since the passing of the Civil List Act, 1837, by which treasure trove, as one of the hereditary revenues of the Crown, was transferred to the Treasury; and also a note of the legal proceedings, if any, which have been instituted since 1837 for the recovery of treasure trove.

Mr. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, before the Government takes proceedings against the Trustees of the British Museum to compel the restitution of certain Celtic ornaments, an opportunity will be given to the House of Commons to express its opinion as to the advisability of such action; and if so, on what Vote.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I stated yesterday in answer to a question put by the right hon. Gentleman opposite that a summary of the correspondence between the Government and the Trustees of the British Museum in reference to the gold Celtic antiquities would be laid on the Table of the House. The only purpose of the proceedings to be taken is to decide the question of law whether the ornaments are treasure trove or not; and I do not think a debate in the House would be of any advantage in settling that legal point. I may remind my hon. friend that the question was discussed briefly last Friday, when the British Museum Vote was taken.* The Government are not prepared to cause a general inquiry to be made as to the title on which the trustees of the national museums of the three countries hold various articles in their possession. Such an inquiry would be endless, and would serve no useful purpose; nor do I think it desirable to include in the Papers that will shortly be laid before the House a great mass of documents that have accumulated during the last sixty-three years for which my friend the hon. Member for Oswestry asks. I am advised that they are very bulky, and that their publication would be expensive. Under these circumstances, unless my hon. friend can give some other reason which I have not now in my possession, I do not think any public advantage would be gained by presenting these Papers to the House.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxix., p. 787.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether any legal proceedings similar to those now proposed with regard to the British Museum have been taken during the present reign?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should think not, Sir. Certainly I am not aware that any other semi-public Department like the British Museum has refused to accept the law as laid down by the Law Officers of the Crown.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE AT PARIS.

MR. PIERPOINT (Warrington): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that an Inter-Parliamentary Conference is to be opened in the hall of the French Senate on 21st July; and whether he proposes that authority or leave of absence should be given to any Members of this House to appear at that conference as representatives of this Parliament.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think there is to be an Inter-Parliamentary Conference. I do not know whether any Members wish to attend; if they do there will be no difficulty, I imagine, in their obtaining leave.

SELECTION (STANDING ORDERS).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following fifteen Members in respect of the Executors (Scotland) Bill:—Mr. Asher, Sir Charles Cameron, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Alexander Cross, Colonel Denny, Mr. Dewar, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gordon, Sir Lewis M'Iver, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Renshaw, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Sir Walter Thorburn, and Mr. Wylie.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to the Uganda Railway Bill.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Law as to Marriage contracted in the Colonies with a Deceased Wife's Sister." Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill [Lords].

COLONIAL MARRIAGES (DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 264.]

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 231.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 231.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 265.]

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Sir John Colomb, Mr. Hanbury, and Mr. Johnson-Ferguson nominated Members of the Select Committee on the Post Office Sites Bill, with two Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.—(*Sir William Walrond.*)

---

* See page 179 of this volume.

NEW BILLS.

BURIAL GROUNDS (LOANS) (SCOTLAND).

Bill to extend the period of repayment of Loans for Burial Grounds in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Morley and Captain Sinclair.

BURIAL GROUNDS (LOANS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To extend the period of repayment of Loans for Burial Grounds in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read the second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 266.]

LARCENY ACT (1861) AMENDMENT.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I beg to ask leave to bring in a Bill to amend Section 75 of the Larceny Act, 1861. The object is to make the section apply to cases of misapplication of money even when the directions for the application of the money have not been put in writing. It is proposed to do this by striking out the words "in writing," for we have found that the section as it now stands has given an opportunity in many cases to misapply funds.

Bill to amend Section 75 of the Larceny Act, 1861, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, and Mr. Solicitor General.

LARCENY ACT (1861) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend Section 75 of the Larceny Act, 1861," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 267.]

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1900-1901.

CLASS II.

1. £51,299, to complete the sum for Treasury and Subordinate Departments.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said that as the salary of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was one of the items in the Estimate before the Committee he supposed it was competent for him (Mr. Bartley) to refer to the arrangement for the collection in certain special cases. With regard to the Jamaica Railway the Committee would remember a special arrangement was entered into with the colony, by which a certain sum was charged on the debentures of that railway. An arrangement was made by which if there was any failure in the payments of interest colonial bonds were to be given, and that when any default took place certain contingencies should arise. The railway to a certain extent failed, and was taken over by the colony, and certain means were taken to give it financial assistance, and certain payments were made. The debentures were largely held by trustees, no interest was paid for some time, but after a considerable delay of three years the interest which should have been paid every year was paid, with the result that the increased income tax was charged instead of the income tax which should have been charged if the interest had been paid at the proper time.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. Gentleman is right to raise this question upon this Vote.

MR. BARTLEY said he thought it was a matter of direction, that it was collected by the Board of Revenue by the direction of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.) said the collection of Revenue was not a matter of direction at all. It was a matter of law.

MR. BARTLEY said he was not prepared to pursue the matter further if it was ruled out of order, but he was under the impression that this was the only occasion upon which the question could be raised.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think it ought to come in on the Vote for the Inland Revenue.

MR. BARTLEY urged that the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue was under the direction of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was the supreme Minister with regard to such matters.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) confirmed the hon. Member in his opinion that the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue was subservient to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that had the hon. Member called his attention to this matter earlier he would have caused inquiry to be made; but his impression was, with regard to this particular case, that it was one for the consideration of the Inland Revenue authorities.

*THE CHAIRMAN: After the statement of the right hon. Gentleman I think this question ought to be raised on the salary of the Board of Inland Revenue.

MR. BARTLEY, on a point of order, said that if the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue took his instructions from the Chancellor of the Exchequer—who was, after all, the fountain head of all authority in finance—he thought the right hon. Gentleman exceeded his power in claiming this particular payment.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I do not claim it.

MR. BARTLEY: Well, you have got it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES expressed the opinion that the right hon. Gentleman under-estimated his power in the matter. The Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue was authorised by statute to act on the direction of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and that was the exact point raised by the hon. Member for North Islington.

*THE CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, if this question can be raised at all it can only be raised on the salary of the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue.

MR. BARTLEY: Do I understand that you will allow the question to be raised upon that Vote, Sir?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I will deal with that question when it arises on the Vote.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer exercised discretion jointly with the Colonial Office with regard to important officers called Crown Agents. Each Crown colony had its own agent, and these Crown Agents received their remuneration out of an accumulated sum of commissions and percentages, which now amounted to about £340,000, and that sum represented about twelve years commission on their expenditure. It had been recognised by the Treasury that when the accumulated sum was more than sufficient to meet emergencies then the commission should be reduced. It was reduced in 1868 by the Treasury, the principle having been laid down in 1863. It seemed to him that, as the fund had reached £340,000, the time had arrived when the matter should be reconsidered by the Treasury as to whether the commission ought to be reduced. He thought the commission with regard to the Uganda Railway might have been dispensed with altogether. What he wished to ask was whether the right hon. Gentleman would consider this matter, for he was asking the right hon. Gentleman to do no more than had been done in previous cases in 1868. He wished to know if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take this matter into consideration, and consider whether the time had not arrived for making some further reduction in the commission levied by the Crown Agents, and also in the permanent contribution by the leading Crown colonies to the salaries of Crown Agents.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have nothing whatever to do with it. It is perfectly possible that in 1868 the Colonial Secretary, having to deal with questions within his own Department, did consult the Treasury on the reduction referred to, but the decision rested with him entirely. I cannot initiate any change in regard to the payment of commission to the Crown Agents. Of course, if my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary were to consult me, as the head of the Treasury, on the matter, I could give an opinion, but that is all.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): Like the hon. Member for King's Lynn, I rise not to make a complaint, but to make a suggestion which I think would be to the public benefit if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be good enough to listen to it. It relates to the annual statement he makes to the House, known as his Budget statement, a copy of which I have in my hand. We find at the bottom of the column the total estimated expenditure. The estimated national expenditure is understood to be £149,000,000. The objection I raise is that it is bad book-keeping, which would not be tolerated in any well-managed business, to lump together as national expenditure outlay that is for national purposes with outlay that is for reproductive purposes. We must bear in mind what the country understands by national expenditure. That is understood as meaning expenditure for the carrying on of the business of the nation such as the Army, the Navy, and the Civil Service. That is the understanding, and when you come to the carrying on of a private business such as the Post Office and the Telegraph Department, that is not national expenditure in any sense whatever. Originally the Post Office was conducted by private enterprise, and there is no particular reason why it should not be treated in that way now. The nation has taken it over as a business, out of which we make a profit of something like £4,000,000, but that is not the same as carrying on the Army and Navy and other unproductive expenditure in the ordinary sense of the term. We have on the expenditure side the sum of £12,500,000, which goes to swell the general national expenditure, but it is met by an item on the other side of £17,000,000, showing a profit. I venture to suggest that the only way to give the nation a true idea of the finances is to keep a separate account. If you open a post office business you should keep a separate account and simply bring to your general account the profit or loss accordingly as you have made a profit or a loss. The Committee will see at once the absurdity into which we are landed if you carry out this system further. Suppose the nation was to take over the management of the railways, which is done in Belgium, what would be the result if you followed this system of book-keeping? I should think it would more than double the national expenditure. If you lumped it together in this way it would seem as though the national expenditure had doubled. The Chancellor of the Exchequer may say that all this expenditure is clearly laid down in the Return, but the Return only appears in the summer—I believe it did not appear last year until the 31st of July—and what I complain of is that this Return is what the nation judges by. My point is that then the whole thing has gone by public interest. I do not think many hon. Members of the House see the second Return, with the exception of a few experts. The Chancellor of the Exchequer may argue that no one is deceived, but I think it is calculated to deceive even the most alert. At the time of the Jubilee the House was delighted with a most interesting and charming comparison which the right hon. Gentleman gave us of the expenditure as compared with the time of the accession of the Queen and the year of her Jubilee. All that is extremely interesting, and it is well that the nation should look at these things. But it was not true, because the figures which the Chancellor of the Exchequer based that comparison upon were not correct. At the time the Queen came to the Throne a proper system of book-keeping was adopted in this matter, and the gross expenditure in working the Post Office was not then put down as a portion of the national expenditure. I think we may well understand how it might mislead the whole press of the country. Everybody made comparisons about the wonderful leaps in our expenditure. Of course we are quite ready to acknowledge that the expenditure is much more than we like, but what I ask is that the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer shall show what it is, and not that we shall have an unreal and inflated expenditure, upon which all our comparisons may be absolutely erroneous. I ventured to call the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to this matter a short time ago, and I believe he told me that the system was instituted by Mr. Gladstone. I am bound to say that there is too much of a tendency to try and knock people down by a great name. No doubt other reasons could be given, but each generation must solve its own problem. I venture to say that some such change as I suggest is now necessary for the correct apprehension of the national expenditure. This is necessary in order that we may make correct comparisons from year to year of such expenditure, and in order that the nation may have a clear account before it as to whether any business it undertakes gives a profit or a loss. I venture to say that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer will couple my suggestion with his next statement it will be made very much clearer.

*Sir M. HICKS BEACH: To draw up the Budget statement in the way suggested would be contrary to the custom which has prevailed—and a very good custom—since 1854, and which is required by statute. By this custom the total expenditure of the Post Office is placed on one side, while on the other side you have a return of the receipts derived from the Post Office. The result of the alterations suggested would be that much less information would be given to the House on the subject than is now given. I could not adopt the proposal of the hon. Member, and I do not agree with his views on the subject. If anyone requires to see what the net results are of the different heads of revenue he will see it in the Return which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton moves for every year, in which the net public income and the net public expenditure is stated under certain specified heads.

MR. HARWOOD: I thank the right hon. Gentleman for his reply. I only wish to state that I was quite aware of the Return to which he has just alluded, but it is perfectly clear that that is not a statement which goes before the nation. Might I suggest to the right hon. Gentleman, who has already shown a spirit of true finance, that he should have three columns instead of two as at present? It is not good book-keeping as it is.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The hon. Gentleman has taken an objection to the public accounts of this country which seems to me not only to be entirely unfounded, but to suggest an alteration in an entirely wrong direction. He says that there are twelve millions too much put down in the accounts.

MR. HARWOOD: It ought to appear in a separate account.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Does the hon. Gentleman apprehend that we keep no capital account? Ours is an annual cash account, beginning on the first day of the financial year and ending on the last. I do not say that that system is absolutely perfect as a system of book-keeping. The Post Office ought to have a capital account in which its buildings and its stores should be included. We have deliberately restricted our national account to a cash account, and we have said that so strict shall the account be that if a penny or a million is left over at the end of the year, beyond the money actually expended, it shall go to the reduction of the National Debt. I will invite the hon. Gentleman to consider what is national expenditure. We levy taxation in return for certain services. There is the soldier's service, the policeman's service, and the postman's service. The postman is just as much a servant of the State as the soldier. The fact that the Post Office makes a certain amount of money has nothing to do with it. If you want to post a letter you have a compulsory charge levied upon you, and that is taxation. If you want your homes and commerce defended you have another compulsory charge, and if you want to conquer South Africa or China there is a still further compulsory charge. These are all charges in return for services, and it no more ceases to be taxation because it is needed for the postman than if it had been for the sailor or the soldier. I agree with the hon. Gentleman that every farthing of expenditure with regard to the Post Office should be put down as national expenditure. I go further than the hon. Gentleman, and I say that the serious defect in our accounts is in the direction contrary to that suggested by him. There are omitted from our national accounts year after year since 1868 very large items which are also expenditure. They are the contribution to the Local Taxation Account; appropriations-in-aid, which are sums received by the Departments from various sources, including a million paid by India; the profit on the coinage and the Mint, and all the enormous receipts of the public Departments which never come into the Estimates, and over which this House has no control, as well as the expenditure out of receipts, as it is called. For instance, the Post Office pays the railway companies for the carriage of parcels out of its receipts. These contributions amount altogether to seventeen millions of money every year, and this year I think they will amount to eighteen millions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is a conscientious man, and he gives us a little note with reference to these amounts, but they are not included in the total. His conscience extends as far as the note, but not as far as the total. The effect of this omission is to make a comparison between this year's accounts and any year's accounts before 1868 absolutely delusive. Before 1868 appropriations in aid were very small; since then they have risen year by year, million by million, until they are now about six millions, and the total of all these omitted items amounts to seventeen millions. Therefore, instead of saying that the accounts contain twelve millions too much, I say that that twelve millions is in its right place, and that we ought to add seventeen millions to it to make it a good account. I think the contention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the twelve millions ought to remain is absolutely right, but I believe also I am equally right in saying that the accounts ought to contain the seventeen millions now omitted.

Vote agreed to.

2. £7,340 to complete the sum for Privy Council Office.

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): I should like to ask the Secretary to the Treasury a question about the salary of the Registrar of the Privy Council. The gentleman who holds this office has been put in at the maximum salary of £1,500 a year, whereas his predecessor was appointed at £1,200 a year, rising after five years to £1,500. I do not know this gentleman, but I knew his predecessor, Mr. Harley, who is now a member of the Viceroy's Council in India. He did the work at £1,200 a year, and an abler man could not be got to do it, and I am perfectly certain his successor is not a more able man. The Secretary to the Treasury when this matter was brought forward before said that on the whole there would be a saving on the Estimates, because the gentleman who was made Registrar of the Council had held an office in the Civil Service Commission, and that the number of Commissioners would be diminished. That may have been a very good administrative work, but if that reduction were to be carried through there surely was no reason why this gentleman should not get his new office under the conditions on which it was held by his predecessors. He had a salary of £1,200 a year in the Civil Service Commission, with, as the Secretary to the Treasury says, the probability of a further rise. I do not know what he means by that. I suppose he meant that this gentleman might possibly become Chief Commissioner. He certainly had no legal claim to any increase of salary beyond £1,200, and there was no reason for putting him into the office on exceptionally favourable terms. Even if he had started at £1,200 he would have been better off than if he had remained at the Civil Service Commission, because he would have an assurance that he would have £1,500 in five years. I think we ought to get some explanation on the subject, because this appears to me to have been an unnecessary expenditure.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I have already explained this matter once this session. The hon. Gentleman has fairly stated what happened, but certain additions have to be made to his statement. The gentleman appointed to this office at the maximum salary was appointed to a very great extent to suit the convenience of the Government. We wanted to effect an economy by reducing the number of the Commissioners, and an opportunity was afforded whan this post fell vacant. The gentleman appointed was already receiving £1,200, with a prospect of rising to £1,500. Then it is asked, why not treat him exactly as the other gentleman who had been previously appointed to the office? In the first place, he was already in the Government service, and in the next place he had no great anxiety to leave the office he was in, and in which he was on the road to promotion, but in order to permit of this economy he went. He was removed from an office where he had served a great number of years to another office to do entirely different work. After all, the extra charge extends only over a few years. I am sure the hon. Gentleman will agree with me that in this case real economy was effected, and that there were very special circumstances why this gentleman should have received the maximum salary.

MR. BUCHANAN: What I complain of is that this gentleman was appointed at the maximum salary, which ordinarily would have only been reached in five years. He was enjoying the maximum salary in his own department, which was just the initial salary of his new position.

Vote agreed to.

3. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,028, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Agriculture, and to pay certain Grants in Aid."

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I desire to ask the right hon. the President of the Board of Agriculture what is the present condition of things in regard to swine fever. For many years we have had a great deal of trouble with this question, and the Government have spent a very large sum of money indeed, but have really done very little in stamping out the swine fever. It is quite true that at certain seasons of the year the swine fever decreases. I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in his opinion, he is really making any substantial progress in the stamping out of swine fever, and does he really think that in a short period he will be able to say that it is stamped out entirely, as he has stamped out rabies to the satisfaction of the country? Does he think that swine fever produces itself, or only arises from contagion? A good deal of dissatisfaction is caused at the present time amongst farmers and dealers by restrictions on the movements of swine, but that dissatisfaction would decrease if the right hon. Gentleman could give any assurance that an end will be put to this state of things in the immediate future.

MR. MARTIN (Worcestershire, Droitwich) said that in many parts of the country pigs were fed on carrion, offal, and other articles utterly unfit for the food of an animal destined for human consumption. Some progress might be made with stamping out swine fever if the inspectors of the Board of Agriculture were to see how the animals were fed.

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, E.): I wish to draw attention to the subject of the restrictions which the Board of Agriculture find it their duty to impose where disease breaks out amongst cattle. Some months ago there was an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk. The principle followed by the Board of Agriculture in these cases is, no doubt, a perfectly proper principle if properly applied. It is to impose such restrictions on the district where foot and mouth or any other disease breaks out as to prevent the spread of the disease to any other part of the country. No patriotic stock-owner will object to a certain amount of inconvenience in order to prevent such a national disaster as the spread of disease throughout the length and breadth of the country. I wish to say that in the county I represent there is no rebellion against the general law. We quite understand that restrictions must be imposed, but it is only because we feel that the present method of imposing them is unfair that I make my protest against it. I wish it to be understood that I have a good deal of sympathy with the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture. His position is an extremely difficult one. He is most anxious to prevent the spread of disease to all parts of the country from the particular district in which it arises, and it leads him to make the restrictions greater than perhaps they might need be. Imposing restrictions on a district in order to prevent the spread of disease is in the nature of an insurance to the rest of the country, and the premium is paid by the loss and inconvenience suffered in the contaminated district. The Department of Agriculture undertakes the payment of compensation for loss suffered, but only to a small extent. It compensates for the bullocks slaughtered, but not the indirect loss incurred. In Norfolk and Suffolk what happened was this: Immediately the right hon. Gentleman's Department knew of the outbreak he did what was the right thing—namely, sent down at once a first-class inspector, who scheduled a considerable area. The method is no doubt a little rough and ready, and if it were only for a few days it would not matter. But the inspector takes a certain radius round the place of infection, and includes not only that radius, but all the petty sessions districts round that area, the reason being that these petty sessions districts are more easily policed. But if the restriction Order is to last some months, the original area included is a great deal too large. It represents twenty square miles, and the petty sessions districts which impinge on these twenty miles may be more than forty miles distant from the radius of infection. The view taken in Norfolk is that, although it may be necessary in the first place to make a very considerable area the subject of restriction, at the earliest possible moment a first-class inspector, who thoroughly understands the subject, should be sent down to inspect the area first proclaimed, and then he should map out a scientific area, having regard to the various means of communication. Infection is carried in various ways. It may be carried by human beings, by the clothes of human beings, by beasts, by the fowls of the air, and by inanimate substances in contact with infection. What is wanted is that the inanimate substances lying about a farm should be destroyed or thoroughly disinfected and the buildings very carefully disinfected. And then a very careful watch should be kept on the immediate neighbourhood in order to prevent human beings and beasts having any chance of being infected moving about and spreading the disease. That we thoroughly understand and agree to. But in point of fact we are afraid that the local disinfection of the premises where the disease breaks out is not properly carried out by men who thoroughly understand disinfection. I am not going to make any attack upon the inspectors or sub-inspectors of the Board of Agriculture. I know them to be very excellent gentlemen who understand their business. But I do not believe they are specialists in such subjects as disinfection, or know the pathology of one disease from another. I understand that the last outbreak that took place arose from the fact that some fodder which had been in contact with the diseased beasts, or the man who slaughtered them, was not destroyed, but was ultimately consumed by other beasts, and so the disease was spread. That showed a lamentable want of care in disinfecting. All matters like hay should be at once destroyed. In addition to that, there were buildings which should have been disinfected in the ordinary way with quicklime; but I am informed, and the public down in Norfolk believe, that in point of fact the disinfecting was done not with quicklime, but with slaked lime or whitewash, which had no effect. I put it to the right hon. Gentleman that these restrictions, although they are perfectly necessary—and no one denies that—should be put on with the greatest care and circumspection. If the restrictions are made so severe as to appear to be unjust, you will not succeed in preventing infection, and you will not get loyal obedience to the restriction Order. In point of fact the feeling of exasperation in Norfolk is very great indeed. In one case the Order was, no doubt, infringed, and remarks were made on the bench about the stringency of the Order. I do not in the least identify myself with those remarks, which were, to say the least, not very judicial. But the mere fact that such things were said strongly condemning the restrictions, and that only nominal fines were imposed, shows that there is a feeling general throughout the county that the regulations are stronger than they need be, and that the work of the Department has not been carried out in the best possible way. I may be out of order in alluding to the subject of compensation, as that does not come within the Executive Department of the right hon. Gentleman. But I would like to say that I do not believe that the system of the Board of Agriculture will ever be loyally adhered to while the loss involved is so enormous. In this outbreak there were 30,000 fat cattle ready for the market, and I have no doubt that the loss was about £2 per beast, or £60,000 in a small area of the county. There never will be loyal co-operation between the owners of cattle and the Department in the stamping out of the disease until a better system of compensation is adopted. At present it is the interest of a farmer to have diseased beasts, because they are slaughtered and paid for, but his neighbour cannot move his beasts about or send them to market; he has to buy food for them, and the loss to him is extremely great. Although there is a danger of the Department being swindled, the possibility of a swindle should not prevent the farmers who suffer that loss being compensated. The country gets the benefit of the insurance and ought to pay the premium. I do not wish to appear to be condemning the right hon. Gentleman too much, but I feel it my duty to move the reduction of this Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,928, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Price.*)

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has made an excellent speech in the interests of his constituents, and has invested his remarks with some scientific interest. But we, who do not belong to Norfolk, but consider the interests of the country as a whole, take a broader view of the case and wish to back up the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture on the restrictions he very properly puts on, in order to isolate and stamp out all these types of disease which do not spring up spontaneously, and probably are brought from abroad to smoulder amongst us until they break out with virulence. They can only be eradicated by the policy which the right hon. Gentleman initiated, and which he is carrying out with vigour and courage, and which, I trust, in spite of the opposition he has met with, he will continue to carry on with the same vigour. I congratulate him on his issue of the muzzling order, which has had the result of extinguishing that most terrible of all diseases which afflict humanity—hydrophobia. I am sure there is not a single scientific man in the country who does not congratulate him. I saw in a paper the other day that a movement has been set on foot in scientific centres to present my right hon. friend with a testimonial for the purpose of showing the gratitude, not so much of the general public but of the scientific world, for his efforts for the extinction of hydrophobia by the same means by which he proposes to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease and make our herds and flocks as clean and clear of infection as ever they were before. I want to ask the right hon. Gentleman one or two questions in a friendly spirit. First, whether he is able to give the House any information as to where the infection comes from—whether from abroad or from places where the disease existed before, and where it had been smouldering, and the all-prevailing bacilli had been lying low, biding their time until the conditions were more favourable for their active propagation. Then, is it the right hon. Gentleman's opinion or that of his scientific advisers, that the disease springs up spontaneously? I know that to suggest that is heretical, but it would be very interesting to know if my right hon. friend has any evidence at his disposal to prove that this disease may spring up spontaneously? I do not think that sufficient use is made of the process of combustion. Disinfection is often a mere sham. At all events, my right hon. friend takes the right course in isolating particular districts and thus keeping infection from spreading, and I hope he will not be induced to depart from that course by the excellent oratory of the hon. Member for Norfolk.

MR. H. S. FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft): As the outbreak of foot and mouth disease occurred in my own division of Suffolk, and many of my constituents suffered severely from the restrictions imposed by the Board of Agriculture, I wish to say that I most heartily support the policy of my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Agriculture. Undoubtedly those who suffered in pocket are desirous of sacrificing somebody, and at the present moment the President of the Board of Agriculture is not the most popular man of the day, and it would be a popular thing, from some points of view, to join in the outcry against him. But anybody who knows the terribly infectious and virulent character of foot and mouth disease must admit that nothing but the most stringent regulations can stamp it out. I am sure no one would be more ready than the hon. Gentleman opposite to acknowledge that the President of the Board of Agriculture has shown the utmost sympathy with the farmers who have suffered loss, and has manifested the greatest regret when compelled to enforce his regulations. It seems rather hard, when these regulations are necessarily imposed for the benefit of the whole community, that the whole loss should fall on the restricted and isolated areas. If compensation were awarded, as I contend it should be in the case of all those who have to suffer restrictions for the public good, out of public funds, the irritation would at once disappear. In the case of glanders, which affects horses, it was found that the only effective means to arrest its spread was to destroy the animals attacked. In this way glanders was stamped out of the Army. But in London, where compensation is not given by the local authority, it is to the interest of the private owner of horses—say, the driver of a cab who owns his own horses and to whom the destruction of his horses means ruin—to conceal the disease; whereas if it were to his interest to disclose the existence of the disease the public interest would be safeguarded. I know that my right hon. friend has no power to deal with the question of compensation, but it does seem to me to be a hardship that the owners of cattle in any particular locality, when disease breaks out, should be subjected to isolation, causing great damage, and should receive no compensation for what they are called upon to suffer in order to prevent the spread of the disease to other neighbourhoods.

*MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.): I object to the method of the application of the restrictions. The area scheduled in Norfolk when the first outbreak occurred was unnecessarily large. This was clearly proved by the fact that neither in the case of the outbreak in Bedfordshire, nor of the second outbreak in Norfolk, was it thought necessary to schedule nearly so large a district as on the first occasion. Therefore I think that in this respect there was a very real grievance. Another point which is felt very strongly is that the facilities for moving stock were not given as soon as they might have been. Cases were so serious as regards the want of food that the magistrates, while they did not refuse to convict, only put on the minimum fine of a farthing per head on each of the stock moved. If there had been permission given to move the stock under proper conditions with an order at a reasonably earlier date a good deal of friction and difficulty might have been avoided. We had the spectacle of a large number of magistrates themselves breaking the law. In fact, if you went over the district you would find that there was hardly a single magistrate who had not himself been obliged to break the law. That is an unsatisfactory state of things.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. LONG, Liverpool, West Derby): I shall begin by replying to the questions asked by the hon. Member for South Somerset as to whether we are making any progress in the stamping out of swine fever, and also whether there is any doubt as to the prevalence of the disease. I do not like to prophesy what may be the result as regards swine fever, but I can assure the hon. Gentleman and the Committee that the answer I have to give is, on the whole, satisfactory. The gross cost in 1897-98 was £125,000, but for the year 1899-1900 that amount has fallen to £78,700. The outbreaks in 1898-99 stood at 2,400, while in 1899-1900 they were 2,100, and, whereas the outbreaks for the first twenty-four weeks of last year were 1,370, in the same period this year they have fallen to just over 1,000. This is almost the smallest number for that period we have had. Generally speaking, over the whole country there is a decided improvement in regard to this most insidious disease, and we have every reason to believe, if our efforts are supported by the local authorities, that it will be as satisfactorily dealt with as other diseases have been. Probably this disease is more insidious in its character than any of the other diseases we know of, and the animals are more easily moved from one place to another than is the case with the larger classes of stock. Of course the people whose stock suffers from the disease lose heavily from the regulations which are imposed with the view of exterminating the disease. As to foot and mouth disease in the eastern counties, I desire to say that, in my opinion, the action of the Norfolk magistrates is profoundly to be deplored. It is the duty of magistrates to administer the law as they find it, and not to seek to evade their responsibilities. I do not think that any good turn is done to these gentlemen by referring to their action. If satisfactory fines are not imposed upon offenders against the regulations, obviously the difficulties of securing the speedy extinction of the disease, and of the Department of Agriculture are largely increased. With regard to swine fever there is no doubt in the minds of experts of the Department as to the character of the disease. It has been suggested by an hon. Member that the feeding of the animals may have something to do with the outbreak of the disease. I do not think there is any justification for any opinion of that kind, and I am bound to say that I am not prepared to accept for my inspectors that the rather difficult task should be allotted to them of inspecting the food of pigs throughout the United Kingdom. I am not sure whether the feeding of pigs is properly or improperly conducted. I believe pigs eat a good deal I should not like to eat myself. I don't think the Board of Agriculture can undertake to restrict the appetite of pigs or control the articles they feed upon. Apart from that I can assure the Committee that there is not the smallest doubt whatever as to the real nature of the disease. It is highly infectious; and this makes it of vital importance that the regulations of the Department should be loyally accepted and carried out unless it can be shown, as it never has been shown, that they are unjust or that our policy is not likely to lead to success. As a matter of fact, at present there is no country in the world which stands with regard to disease in animals in as satisfactory a position as that occupied by Great Britain. This satisfactory position of affairs has been brought about by the vigorous policy of the officials of the Department with which I am connected, and I think it is some indication of the results they are likely to achieve in regard to this disease of swine fever. There is every reason to hope that we will ultimately suppress it. I would like to take this opportunity of acknowledging the great debt of gratitude I owe to the medical and scientific men of this country for the uniform support they have given me from the commencement of my labours in connection with rabies, and also to the Members on both sides of the House for the support they have given me in spite of the unpopularity and difficulties it has brought upon them in their constituencies. I am glad that our labours have been so successful, for I believe that the disease has been practically exterminated, and, with a loyal obedience to the regulations which the Department have thought it necessary to impose in regard to imported dogs, I believe there is no reason why we should not hope to protect the country against any fresh introduction of this most terrible disease. The hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire asked, as to the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Norfolk, whether we are certain as to the nature of the disease. The evidence as to this is overwhelming. As to where the disease came from, it is almost impossible to discover that; but I have little doubt that if we got at the facts it would be found that the infection was brought to one of our ports. We can only pursue our policy of immediately drawing a cordon so as to, as far as possible, keep within the area all possible means of infection, and place the strictest restrictions on the stock and their movements in the neighbourhood likely to be affected. Then complaint is made as to the size of the areas; but I contend that it is better at first to have big areas and then narrow them down than to begin with small areas which may have to be increased. I do not hesitate to say that in this policy of good big areas rests a large part of the security we derive from the regulations, leading to the extermination of the outbreaks in a comparatively small space of time. We make ourselves acquainted with the geographical conditions, roads and places where markets are held, the direction in which cattle are likely to travel, and other local facts, and, according to these local circumstances and conditions and the previous history of the locality, we make such an area as we think is suitable and safe; and because the area in Bedford is smaller than in Norfolk, there is no reason to suggest that the original policy of forming at first a large area is an unwise one, or one we see any reason to depart from. With regard to disinfection it is quite true there is no hard and fast rule as to the way in which that should be carried out. The suggestion has been made that my inspectors are not sufficiently qualified. The general rules are laid down by experts, so that the actual work can be carried out by men who are not scientific. I have every reason to believe that disinfection generally is carried out in a thoroughly efficient and satisfactory manner. There is only one other word I have to say, I entirely sympathise with the view that farmers and others who are placed under restrictions suffer very heavily in connection with these outbreaks. I know also that they suffer in other ways than from loss of stock, but we have to consider the advantage and the convenience of the vast majority of the community. No doubt, if any one could induce the Treasury authorities to give the Board of Agriculture more money, we could do more; but I do not think there is any prospect of that kind. The expenditure is rapidly decreasing, and the loss that follows the enforcement of the regulations is not nearly so large as it would be if these diseases were allowed to run riot. If the local authorities will support us and realise their responsibilities in the administration of justice, I believe the best remedy will come from the absence of the necessity for regulations in consequence of the absence of disease.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I wish to associate myself with the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire in approving of the policy which is being carried out with regard to the disease. In the case of the first outbreak in Norfolk or Suffolk—I am not sure whether it was the one or the other—there was a certain lack of promptitude on the part, I think, of the farmers concerned in reporting to the police or the local authority the nature of the outbreak upon their premises. There seems to have been some confusion or uncertainty in their minds whether it was foot and mouth disease or not. As regards promptitude in dealing with outbreaks that may arise in future, I should like to ask my right hon. friend whether any steps had been taken by the Board of Agriculture to issue information or to increase the power of the local authorities. That seems to me a matter of the highest importance. The policy of taking the largest possible area for the restrictive orders is clearly the wisest and best way of dealing with this question. I would congratulate my right hon. friend very heartily on the way the policy of the Board of Agriculture has been carried out. The only qualification I should make to that is that there are many agriculturists in the country who would be glad if the restrictions were even stronger and more complete than they are. On the question of compensation I think the right hon. Gentleman laid down sound and courageous doctrines, which I am sure the wisest administrators would gladly and fully support. I am bound to say that I think one expression fell from him which ought to receive more consideration and support in the House. He said he would be glad to have the support of the House in getting more money with the view of carrying out a policy of this kind. I understood him to say that more liberal supplies would enable him more effectively and completely to carry out the policy of stamping out the disease, and in that respect I think the House ought to insist on a more liberal allowance in future to the Board of Agriculture for dealing with these matters. I do not wish to go into the question of the adequacy or inadequacy of the veterinary staff of the Board of Agriculture, but I do think that, having regard to what has been done in France and the United States of America, and elsewhere, if anything we err on the cheeseparing side. I should like to ask one further question, and I am not perfectly certain whether this comes within the control or jurisdiction of the Board of Agriculture or the Board of Trade. Those who have followed the history of this recent outbreak know that cattle have been slaughtered on board ship, and a large number of carcases having been thrown into the sea, some of which, presumably, were diseased, were washed up on the shores on some parts of the eastern counties. In the first place, great complaint is made that the expense of dealing with this mischief falls entirely on the local rates. That is a matter which the local representatives will deal with more properly, but I would like to know what sort of administrative checks have been taken or will be taken with regard to the prevention of the extension of the disease through such carcases and the offal connected with them.

*MR. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): I desire to call attention to a question which is of great importance to the milk supplying farmers in my constituency and that is the continued use of the barn gallon. I believe the origin of supplying milk in this way was to provide against spillage or leakage in transit. A barn gallon, as I understand, has an extra half-pint thrown into each imperial gallon, so that, upon the two imperial gallons which it contains there is an additional pint thrown in, making a total of seventeen pints to the barn gallon. The farmers contend that this allowance for spillage or leakage is no longer necessary, because of the improved vessels used. They further complain that even if they supply by the barn gallon they are debited with spillage or leakage should any occur. It is the dealers who insist upon this antiquated measure being still used, and I desire to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether its use is legal under the Weights and Measures Act. I should imagine that it is not, and if it is not, the fact should be made generally known. It may perhaps be said that if the farmers are called upon to supply more than the imperial gallon, or multiples of the imperial gallon, the remedy would be to increase the price; but that does not seem to be altogether satisfactory, because, if so, what is the use of the Weights and Measures Act? Surely the very object of that Act was to abolish these vexatious and varying methods of supply. I will not ask for a final and complete answer off-hand, but shall be satisfied if the right hon. Gentleman will undertake to look into the matter. If he, being satisfied on inquiry, will use the means at the disposal of his Department to let it be perfectly well-known that this barn gallon is no longer a legal measure he will, I think, do a good thing for the milk producing portion of the agricultural community.

MR. ARTHUR J. MOORE (Londonderry): The point to which I wish to draw attention is the importation of fraudulent foodstuffs. The right hon. Gentleman has done a good deal by strengthening the Act of Parliament dealing with the matter, and we should now be glad of some statement as to the result of the administration of the Food and Drugs Amendment Act passed last year.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I also desire to ask a question upon the same point as that to which the hon. Gentleman has just referred. What I consider is the most important part of the Act of last year is the power possessed by the Board of Agriculture to insist upon the local authorities doing their duty in the analysis of food. When the Act was in Committee upstairs I got an explanatory section put into it for that purpose. What I should like to ask is whether the Board of Agriculture have insisted that the local authorities should perform their duty, so as to secure that food and drugs are sold in a pure condition, and what sort of success they have met with.

*MR. LONG: In reply to the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire, I think there is some justification for the observations of the hon. Gentleman; there has been a certain lack of promptitude in reporting the outbreak of disease in Norfolk, but I do not think that arose from any desire to evade the law and the responsibilities following an outbreak of disease, and therefore we have not thought it necessary to take any steps to strengthen the powers which have been in force. The truth is, there has not been an outbreak for years, and there was a doubt at first whether it was a genuine outbreak of disease. Then I think there has been some misunderstanding as to what I said. I should be sorry if anything I said should give rise to an impression that the Department is in any way deficient in strength for the proper discharge of its duty. The Treasury has always given liberal assistance for the staffs of the Department, both veterinary and hay, and I wish to take this opportunity of at once disposing of the rumour that we are not efficiently equipped, and to state that there is no reason to fear that the duties of the Department will be improperly performed. As to carcases thrown up on the coast as the result of a storm, I have been assured by scientific advisers that they carry no danger of infection, being impregnated with salt, though no doubt they are disagreeable and offensive to the people of the neighbourhood. It is not the duty of the Department to remove these carcases; but they are effectually dealt with by the Coast Guard. As to the question of the hon. Member for Abingdon about barn gallons, it has never been before me as a grievance. I have heard of an extra half-pint working mischief, but not in connection with the milk trade. If my hon. friend will supply me with information on the subject, I shall be glad to put it before the Board of Trade, with whom the administration of the Weights and Measures Acts lies. In relation to the administration of the Food and Drugs Act of last year, I adhere to the view I have before expressed that the main object of the Act was to ensure local action against adulteration, and the function of the Board of Agriculture was to exhaust every effort in urging, and as far as they could, compelling, discharge of this duty before taking action themselves. Nothing could be more disastrous than for the central authority to be ready to do the work which rightly falls to the local authority. To do that would inevitably lead to dilatory and neglectful administration. So far as I am aware the operation of the Act last year has been most satisfactory. The Treasury has given assistance, and local authorities have been made fully acquainted with the requirements of the new Act, and I have every reason to believe that the exercise of its power by the Department has led to vigorous administration by local authorities. The Department will leave no stone unturned to make the Food and Drugs Act a success, and to put an end to the adulteration of food.

SIR CUTHBERT QUILTER (Suffolk, Sudbury): What I am anxious to know is this, that while an order has been given for the burial of carcases of deceased cattle washed ashore no order has been given that the pens in which these cattle were confined should be removed. What I ask is, why the same treatment is not meted out so far as the pens are concerned. The other complaint that my constituents have to make is as to the carrying out of the various regulations for the stamping out of swine fever. These seem to be made without any regard to local conditions—to the trend of the different markets. An area is selected which may be an arbitary area, but it often happens that where one lot of swine, owing to the configuration of the country, go to one market, another lot will go in quite a different direction.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said he would like to ask a question with respect to the setting up of standards of milk and butter. There was, he understood, a Departmental inquiry going on, and, when a decision had been come to, the responsibility for circulating such standards would rest with the Board of Agriculture. Was the President of the Board able to give some information as to whether the deliberations were concluded, and whether, if these standards were arrived at, they would be circulated throughout the country? He believed that by the Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment Act of last year the local authorities were bound to appoint qualified analysts. He hoped the Department would take steps to see that that was done, as he knew several cases in which the local authorities thought they had performed their functions by paying their sanitary inspector £5 a year to act in that capacity. There was a general disposition throughout the country in favour of the amending Act being made more stringent. The duty of the public analyst should be properly performed. The right hon. Gentleman did not now appear to have the information up to date as to the percentage of adulteration found in samples taken at the port of entry, although last year and the year before he was able to give interesting figures in this respect. A beneficial effect was produced when it was understood that the Customs were watching the importation of food products and were making analysis. It would do a great deal of good if these investigations were continued, and the results from time to time made public.

*MR. LONG: In answer to my hon. friend the Member for the Sudbury Division, the obvious way of dealing with the pens would be to destroy them by burning, though I do not think it would be necessary, because having been so long in the sea they are so impregnated with sea-water that there could be no danger of infection from them. No doubt they are unsightly, but they can be disposed of in that way. With regard to the areas selected for dealing with swine fever we do take the greatest care in selection, and our selection is governed as far as possible by the local considerations which the hon. Gentleman mentions. Our only object is to prevent the spreading of swine fever, and if any case is brought to our notice that in the selection of any area we have been unduly disregardful of the local conditions, I will take care that we will do better in future. With regard to the Standards Committee I can say nothing until they have reported. With regard to the question raised under the Food and Drugs Act as to the proper examination at the port of entry, that is a duty which rests with the Customs authorities first and the Board of Agriculture afterwards. No doubt the Government has power to bring pressure to bear on local authorities, and with regard to the suggestion as to the efficiency of the examination of imports I shall be glad if I can make any improvements in that respect. I have been asked whether I have at any time had to protest against the action of any local authority. I think that is rather too strong a term, but it has been necessary for me to indicate a few directions where reforms might take place.

MR. WHARTON (Yorkshire, Ripon): Before this debate comes to a conclusion I desire to say a word of congratulation upon the policy of the right hon. Gentleman for the stamping out of rabies. The policy was unpopular, but the right hon. Gentleman stoutly adhered to it, with the result that the country has been freed from a very terrible disease. As to the appointment of good analysts, I have myself seen the benefit of such a policy, and I think it would be a very good thing if local authorities were to appoint good analysts.

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

4. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £23,036, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of pay-

ment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and expenses of the Charity Commission for England and Wales."

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I should like to know whether any proceedings have been taken last year under the Charity Trust Recovery Act of 1891, which enabled the Charity Commissioners to recover charities lost in the not dim and distant past. It is a fact that charities have disappeared and are lost, but I hope nothing of that kind has been going on this year. In many instances there has been very laudable vigilance in looking after valuable charities and insisting on proper value being received for any charity lands which have been sold. Not long since, I had occasion to call the attention of the Charity Commissioners to the sale of land in connection with a charity in Northamptonshire, and to ask that steps should be taken to interfere with that sale. I may mention this case as illustrating something which is going on in the country, and to which I wish specially to call attention. This small charity had as part of its property a certain amount of land on which cottages were built. These cottages fell into a state of bad repair, and the question of their restoration became a subject of correspondence with the Charity Commissioners. In many such cases the amount of money required is more than the trust is able to afford, and the cottages go on from bad to worse, and in spite of the want of decent houses in many rural districts, cottages built on public lands, with certain funds behind them, become unfit for human habitation, and are pulled down or sold. In the case to which I am referring it was decided to sell the cottages, and, consequently, to turn out the persons occupying them. That may have been a desirable course in the interest of public health, but in the interest of the housing of the poor it would have been more desirable if steps had been taken by the Charity Commissioners to enable the cottages to be made fit for human habitation. I applied to the Commissioners to stop the sale for a time and to look after the cottages in the interests of the charity. Although the property was ultimately sold, the amount obtained for it, through the intervention of the Commissioners, was more than was originally anticipated, and the charity received a proper sum for the property, which passed into private hands. I want to draw from that case certain conclusions which, in my opinion, ought to influence the administration of the Charity Commissioners. In the first place I want to induce the Commissioners not to favour the sale of land upon which similar cottages exist, but, in view of the necessity for the better housing of the people they should, as far as possible, retain any charity lands under their supervision, and encourage trustees, or give facilities for the purpose, to put cottages in a better state of repair, so that they may be fit for occupation by the rural poor. Local authorities might very often hire these charity lands for the purpose of erecting thereon houses for the poor. Public lands such as these might be used for public purposes with great advantage to the community and with no detriment to the charity, but I am sorry to see by the Report that they are being largely sold. It is not desirable that we should alienate public lands of any kind. It is desirable that all the lands of this country which are in the hands of public authorities as opposed to private owners should be retained. There is a large amount of land under the control of the Charity Commissioners, but that amount is diminishing at a rate which gives one reason to question the wisdom of the policy of the Commission in this matter. This process of sale has been going on at a very remarkable and increasing rate. In 1890 the amount of money realised by the sale of property connected with the charities of the country was £184,500; in 1899 the amount was nearly £883,000. That is, there had been an increase to nearly five times the amount in those nine years, and that increase has been going on steadily under the present administration. During the years 1893-4-5 the tendency was for the amount of money realised by such sales to go down, the policy of the Charity Commissioners being not to encourage the sale of charity lands, but to retain them as far as possible in the possession of the trustees. During those years the amount decreased steadily from £293,000 in 1893 to £186,000 in 1895. The process now is in the opposite direction, and a very large amount of charity property has been converted into actual money. I do not think the charities have been particularly injured by this process. A good sum of money has been obtained for the property; the money has been invested in Consols, and the trustees have been saved a good deal of trouble with reference to the administration of the charity. But, while that tends to make trustees willing to get rid of lands, it does not remove from the Charity Commissioners or us that care which we ought to exercise to prevent these lands going into private hands. They will be much more difficult to get hold of for public purposes in the future if they are in private hands than they are now. It is true that the recipients of charity may receive as much, or possibly even more, under the system which has been encouraged by the Charity Commissioners, but the good which these lands could do by being used for allotment or building purposes may be lost for ever, and an irreparable injury done to the community, if this process of sale is allowed to go on. I want to ask the hon. Member for Thirsk whether he can tell me the number of acres that are represented by the £883,000. If he cannot tell me now, I hope he will grant me a Return giving an account of these sales during the past year. There is another point I would ask him to bear in mind. In all these cases, before land is sold, it would be very advisable, if an inquiry is not held by the Commissioners as to the needs of the locality, and the possible beneficent uses to which the land might be put, to take the opinion of the parish or district council as to the desirability of allowing the land to pass from the trustees into the hands of private owners. The policy of the Charity Commissioners in former years was to consult the local authorities as far as possible, and the decrease of sales in the years I have referred to was to some extent brought about by the possibilities which the Charity Commissioners saw of the Local Government Act of 1894 bringing them into contact with local authorities whom they might consult with reference to the sale or administration of these lands. I hope that this liberal policy of looking after these inheritances of the poor, so that they may be used for the greatest possible benefit of the poorer classes, may not be lost sight of, and that the parish councils in most localities will in future be consulted before public land of this kind is alienated by being sold to private individuals, the possible future use of it thereby being lost to the community for ever.

Mr. GODDARD (Ipswich): There is a case which I wish to bring before the attention of the Committee. I am afraid I cannot hope to do much good by bringing it forward, because it unfortunately refers to a deed which is already effective. The only thing I can hope to do is to make the case public, and in that way to draw attention to the way in which some of these schemes under the Charity Commissioners are used. This refers to a place called Tydd St. Mary, where some money was left for the purposes of education and apprenticeships. A school was built partly out of this money and partly out of rates. The scheme worked very well up to a certain point, because up to that point the rector of the parish acted in full accord with the trustees and everything went well. But there came a time when a new rector came to the parish, and he seems to have treated the trustees with want of attention; they were mere cyphers in his mind, and he administered the funds entirely at his own sweet will. In 1892 new trustees were appointed, and when they found themselves ignored in the management of the school they withheld the money and put it into the Post Office Savings Bank. A great deal of friction was caused, and at the end of 1893 the rector found himself considerably out of pocket. I think the inspector's report was not very satisfactory, and the rector applied to the trustees for this money, but they refused to hand it over to him. There have been two schemes in regard to this matter, one of 1896, and the other of 1900. By the first scheme there were three trustees appointed by the parish council and five nominated, the first appointed under the scheme, and subsequent vacancies to be filled up by the lord of the manor. I do not know why the vacancies on the trust should be filled by the lord of the manor, except that it was a plan of preventing the parish council appointing a majority of the trustees. By Clause 23 the income of the charity was regulated, and such portion of it was to be applied to the payment of teachers in elementary schools in the parish "as the trustees, the rector and churchwardens, and the lord of the manor may direct,' and as there were eight trustees the trustees were in a majority in this matter. As recently as 1896 the trustees of the charity had a preponderance in deciding what should be paid to the school, and what they paid to the school went towards the teaching. There follow a number of sub-sections regulating the application of the rest of the money, and there is not one word in those sub-sections to suggest any sectarian interest in the scheme. In 1900 there was another scheme. Clause 1 of this new scheme, which was sealed only on the 9th January, 1900, directs that a sum of money in hand, amounting to £114, should be paid to the managers, not for teachers' salaries—that was the protection in the scheme of 1896—but for the repair of the school and school house. It will be clear that that practically amounts to using the trust funds for the purpose of keeping a school board out of the place and preventing the people having a popularly-controlled school. At any rate, that is the effect. If the school could not pass the inspection of the Department a school board would have to be set up. It was before distinctly laid down that the money of this charity was not to be used in relief of the rates, but I maintain that in using this money for the purpose of repairing the school buildings it is really saving the ratepayers' money. Clause 4 of the new scheme also provides that one third of the clear income of the charity must be paid to the school managers in future, so long as the school is conducted as a Voluntary public elementary school and is certified as efficient. That is a new contention. Under the old scheme the trustees had the right to say how much money they would give the school, whereas in this scheme the amount is fixed. Clause 6 provides that the managers of the school should in future be the rector and churchwardens, and one trustee appointed by the trustees of the charity. Consequently the trustees lose all control over the school under the scheme of 1900. I should like to point out what is really the effect of this system, and how bad it is. It is certainly a system which cannot be approved, but it is a good illustration of how the system works. Here we have an endowment left that the children of Lydd might have an education which they could not get without it, and which, of course, ought now to be used to give them, or the clever ones amongst them, a better education than that to which they are by law entitled. That is what the money was left for. The common, the property of the whole village, is utilised for the purpose of building a parochial school, and this charity is used for the purpose of carrying on that school. The Church party in this place manage to turn this parochial school into a Church school. By order of the County Court, made, I expect, before the Charity Commissioners had jurisdiction, the management of this property is placed in the hands of the rector, two churchwardens, and eight trustees of the charity. For some time these work amicably together, until a new clergyman comes, who ignores the trustees altogether. The trustees die off, and there is no one to dispute this assumption of power, until, in 1892, fresh trustees are appointed, who, finding that they are not consulted, pay the money into the savings bank instead of handing it over to the rector. The school gets into such a condition that if this endowment did not exist there would be a school board, and the people of the village would get the management of the school, good buildings, and unsectarian teaching. Instead of that this money is used for the purpose of one particular sect. The Charity Commissioners make a new scheme, order the money to be paid over to the rector of the school, order one-third of the whole income of the charity to be paid over to the school in future, and reduce the charity trustees, so far as the school is concerned, from eight to one, though I have no doubt the endowment is practically the whole of the local income. That is the effect of this scheme. It has completely changed the whole aspect of the position of the school in the parish, and the people very much resent it, more especially as this clergyman happens to be one of those who choose to adopt some of those practices which are considerably objected to by a good many of the people. It is desirable when a scheme of this sort alters the whole purport of an educational plan like that, that it should be made public and brought to the attention of the House of Commons. Although I cannot alter the scheme, I shall perhaps have done some good by drawing attention to it, as it will show the people that this kind of thing is going on, and that unless it is taken notice of it may go on still more. I think the only way in which I can bring pressure to bear is by moving a reduction of the Vote by £100, which I now do.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £22,936, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Goddard.*)

Mr. CHANNING (who was very indistinctly heard) said that before the hon. Member for Thirsk replied, it might be convenient for him to refer to one of the topics which had been raised. The sale of charitable lands was, in his opinion, a bad policy, and an evil which seemed to be growing. According to the Report the amount of land sold during the last four years represented a value of more than double the amount sold during the tenure of office of the previous Administration. That undoubtedly marked a certain change of policy which was greatly to be deplored. With regard to the case of sale which occurred in his own county, to which reference had been made, questions of principle were certainly involved. In the case of this particular charity, the trustees some years ago invested a portion of their money in cottage property, partly with a view to providing accommodation for the labourers of the neighbourhood, and partly as a convenient method of obtaining a reasonable interest on the trust money. Those cottages gradually fell into disrepair; and when the governors and trustees laid a scheme before the Charity Commissioners, that body considered that it involved a larger outlay of money than was justifiable. He wished to press the point that not only was it undesirable that the trustees of charities of this kind should alienate land in their possession, but that it was also undesirable that cottage property should be alienated without any local inquiry or consultation with the local authorities as to the requirements of the village, and apparently without any consideration being present in the minds of the Charity Commissioners except that of getting the largest amount of money. The course taken by the Charity Commissioners in authorising the sale of these cottages without first satisfying themselves that the sale was for the benefit of the whole of the community, and without any information as to the necessity of providing accommodation for the labourers, was very unsatisfactory. He had received a large number of letters from villagers who felt very strongly on the question, and as many as eighty-nine signatures were obtained to a petition urging the Charity Commissioners to withhold their sanction for this sale, and instead to direct the trustees to repair the property and let the cottages to labourers. He desired to ask the hon. Member for Thirsk whether in his opinion it would not be a sounder and wiser policy for the Charity Commissioners to follow in such cases to consider the well-being of the inhabitants of these places quite as much, or, at any rate, on nearly the same footing, as the financial aspect of the question, which, of course, in their fiduciary capacity the Commissioners were bound to guard in every possible way.

Mr. GRANT LAWSON: The Committee will, of course, understand that it is not possible for me to carry in my head the details of the some 80,000 charities under the control of the Charity Commissioners, some large and some small. My hon. friend the Member for Ipswich gave me notice at half-past six this evening that he proposed to say something about the Tydd St. Mary School, but by that time even the Charity Commissioners had adjourned for the day, so that the clerk who is concerned with that question was unable to come to my assistance. But I have some recollection of the case, which came up, I think, about four years since. At that time there was a squabble going on between the churchwarden and the clergyman. I do not intend to enter into the rights or wrongs of that matter, but the point my hon. friend has raised is, I think, a part of that quarrel. The matter was raised in 1896, and I thought it had been comfortably settled. Apparently I was mistaken, and I will, of course, look into it again. But I should like, as I can, to show to the Committee that the scheme of the Charity Commissioners does not deviate from the original purpose of the charity, but that it carries out with absurd accuracy the trust of the deed of 1740 by which this particular charity was founded. Money was left to educate the poor of Tydd St. Mary and to apprentice a certain number of boys. Land was purchased with that money and handed over to three trustees. [The hon. Member read the clause of the trust deed referring to the point.] It is therefore quite obvious that when the gentleman to whom my hon. friend referred refused to pay over the money he was committing a breach of trust, because his duty under the trust was to pay the money into the hands of the minister and the churchwardens. He was, I believe, a churchwarden——

MR. GODDARD: A trustee.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: He was also a churchwarden, and that is how he got the money. He banked the money, he went on banking it, and he did it in his own name. That is how the Charity Commissioners came in, and I think the House will agree that we could not allow the money to go on accumulating in the savings bank in the name of one trustee, when all the while that trustee ought to be paying it to the churchwardens. As to the case referred to by the hon. Members for Ilkeston and Northampton, if I remember rightly it is not an almshouse case. The object of the charity was not to house the working classes. This was property belonging to a charity; and while it is our duty to do the best we can for a particular charity, we have no power to use trust-money for purposes for which it was not intended. If a charity is intended to provide boots and shoes for the poor, we have no power to use that charity for the suppression of nuisances or anything else which we may think to be for the benefit of the neighbourhood. We must see that the money is applied to the purposes for which it was intended, and if the property is sold we must make sure it is sold at a price beneficial to the charity. I wish we had power to deal with every charity in the country to what we considered to be the best advantage for the general welfare of the community. That would be very advantageous, but I very much doubt whether the House of Commons would grant us that general power. In the particular case to which I have been referring I think the medical officer of health condemned the cottages, and there was no money for their repair, and that is how the land came to be sold. With regard to the speech of the hon. Member for Ilkeston, I do not know whether he intended to strike or to stroke the Charity Commissioners. But I think he is altogether mistaken as to one part of his speech. He kept speaking of these as "public" lands. Public lands are lands belonging to the general public. My hon. friend himself is a member of the public, but he has no lot or share in these charity lands; they have to be devoted to the people for whose benefit they were left, and we have to see that the produce of these lands is applied, as near as it can be, to the purposes for which they were left. That is the object for which we work. The hon. Member seemed to suggest that the Charity Commissioners encouraged the sale of these lands. I wish he would try to buy some of the lands from the Commissioners and see if he was able to get them for less than they were worth. There are constant complaints that it is very hard to sell charity lands owing to the obstruction of the Charity Commissioners, and it is really very strange now to hear people saying that the Charity Commissioners are constantly pushing on the business of disposing of charity lands. The hon. Member asked me how many acres had been sold during the past year. I am afraid I cannot give the number now, but I will try to find out in answer to the question. I am not able to say how many acres of land have been sold, but I can inform my hon. friend that the money derived from the sale of land is derived from the sale not of public land, but of public houses. I do not know that I need say anything else to support the position of the Charity Commissioners. We have no definite policy as to these sales, except to see that we get a really good price. We neither encourage nor discourage the sale of land, but if we can get, not only what it is worth, but a great deal more than it is worth, then we sanction the sale of it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): If the Charity Commissioners had the wisdom of the hon. Member who has just sat down, the unpopularity which attaches to them at the present moment would never have an opportunity of developing. But I do not think the hon. Member has been quite fair in dealing with the case raised by the hon. Member for Ipswich. He seems to have overlooked two or three important facts. As far as this charity is concerned its administration has been handed over to the clergy and the churchwardens. The money was really found by the Commissioners, by local subscriptions, and something in the nature of a local rate. Since then the Berrien Charity came in, and although it had not contributed towards the building of the school and did not subscribe towards its maintenance, an amalgamation took place and joint management was agreed to. My complaint against the Commissioners is that this practically annexed the whole of the funds subscribed by the local ratepayers, and handed them over to the churchwardens and the rector. The management of the school is now practically in the hands of the churchwardens and the rector, and I think the hon. Member must admit that that is exceedingly unfair. Is there anything in the original foundation about the doctrines and the dogmas to be taught?—because I understand that is necessary in order to bring it within the Act. Something must have been said in regard to the particular doctrines to be taught in the school prior to the date of that Act. Nothing of that kind has been provided for in the school, and the Charity Commissioners have converted a parochial school, which was managed by a committee representing the ratepayers, into a church school. That is an exceedingly unfair thing to do, but it has been done in a good many cases. This is only a solitary instance which we discovered when it was too late to do anything but protest. My complaint is not in regard to the management of the trust, but in regard to the management of the school. The school was practically built by the ratepayers, and its management should be handed over to a body representing the people, and not to one particular denomination in the parish. Surely the hon. Member opposite must see that that is a very unfair thing to do.

*Mr. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I have had considerable experience of schemes prepared by the Charity Commissioners, and during the last few years I have been greatly struck with the odd and fantastic character of some of those schemes, in regard to the constitution of trusteeships which are provided for under them. Another thing which has struck me is that these schemes, so far as the appointment of trustees is concerned, do not appear to be in harmony with recent legislation. That legislation has in recent years called into existence new public bodies such as county councils, parish councils and parish meetings, and it has given to those new bodies certain powers in connection with the administration of charities. It seems to me that the Charity Commissioners should have recognised this new position of affairs, and that they should have placed the administration of many of these charities unreservedly in the hands of the public bodies appointed in the public interest by the public. Instead of that, in not a few cases, the schemes have been so manipulated as to bring about a certain result—namely, that particular mode of administration is secured by the constitution of the trust, while no room has been allowed for the manifestation of popular feeling in regard to the administration of the trust. I do not mean to accuse the Charity Commissioners of bias in favour of the Established Church, but it is nevertheless the fact that in a large number of cases the trusteeships, constantly, under their schemes, have given an unfair and an improper advantage to the Establishment; so that there are hundreds of cases in which money is now employed for ecclesiastical purposes, contrary to the wishes of the donors. I believe that the weakness and the vice of these schemes of the Charity Commissioners are due to the fact that they adhere to ancient principles and ancient methods, instead of having regard to the new wants and the new feelings of the times. The result is that the public needs are not met in the administration of these charities to the extent they might have been, and ought to be. There are also cases in which the schemes are not administered as they should be on principles of strict equality.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said that owing to the action of the two front benches that evening, no doubt during the next few months there would be a great many applications made similar to that which had been made by the Birmingham School. The result would be that the staff of the Charity Commissioners would be found totally inadequate to deal with those applications, and he urged upon his friend the Secretary to the Treasury to be prepared to make a substantial increase in the staff of the Charity Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said this appeared to be an entirely undenominational trust, but by continuing the clergyman and churchwardens as trustees, and appointing only three representatives of the parish council, who were in a minority of the governing body, practically the school was made a denominational school. That was, of course, clearly contrary to the provisions of the Endowed Schools Act. Under the Endowed Schools Act of 1869, Section 19, educational endowments were not to be treated as denominational unless—

> "In the opinion of the Commissioners (subject to appeal to the Privy Council) the scholars educated by the endowment are required by the express terms of the original instrument of foundation, or of the statutes or regulations made by the founder, or under his authority in his lifetime, or within fifty years after his death, which terms have been observed down to the commencement of the Act, to learn or be instructed according to the doctrines or formularies of any particular church, sect, or denomination."

He should have thought that under this provision the school was exempted.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: I do not think it is an endowed school scheme.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said he thought the Charity Commissioners should have followed the Act and provided that this should have been an undenominational school. He wished to point out to his hon. friend that under the original foundation the money was given for the purpose of giving instruction, whereas under this later scheme the money was being applied for the purpose of building.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 29; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 153.)

AYES.

Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Chas. (Glasgow)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Crae, George
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Souttar, Robinson
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Goddard and Mr. Channing.

NOES.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Blakiston-Houston, John
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Curzon, Viscount
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Heath, James
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howell, William Tudor
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Keswick, William
Knowles, Lees
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt Hon William Edw. H.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool)
Lowe, Francis William
Lyttelton, Lord Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Monckton, Edward Philip
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rutherford, John
Sidebottom, William (Derbysh
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Thornton, Percy M.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Wyndham, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

5. £9,778, to complete the sum for Lunacy Commission, England.

*MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): It is not very frequently that discussions take place in the House of Commons upon the Vote for the salaries and expenses of the Lunacy Commissioners; but I am compelled to-night by recent events that have transpired in London to raise a question of some public importance upon the Vote we have before us. I regret that the Attorney General, who is responsible for this Vote, is not in the House at the present moment to hear what I have to say.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Mr. CALDWELL, Lanarkshire, Mid). House counted, and forty Members being found present,

*MR. JOHN BURNS (continuing): It is very rarely that the Lunacy Commissioners are criticised in the House of Commons, and it is very fortunate for us that that is so, for, generally speaking, the public have confidence in that body, and consequently much of the suspicion that used to exist in England twenty or thirty years ago in regard to the administration of this Department has been removed. I am constrained to-night, however, to call the attention of the Attorney General to what I consider to be a gross scandal in one of the branches of the Lunacy Commissioners' work. Some few weeks ago it was found, owing to the public spirit of Mr. Purchese, that five relieving officers employed by the St. Pancras Board of Guardians had been trafficking with the owners of certain private asylums in London, so that lunatics who ought to have properly gone to asylums controlled by either the London County Council or some other public authority, and there maintained at an average cost of 11s. per week, were diverted to these private asylums, where their weekly maintenance charge ranged from 35s. to 40s. On investigation it was found that these five relieving officers had been in the habit, after the medical officer had certified the lunatics, of not taking too much trouble to inquire where accommodation might be found for them in public asylums, and they were for a consideration given by owners of private asylums transferred to the costly private asylums. The result was that the five officers were brought before the committee, and then before the whole board of guardians, when they owned up as having received presents and sums of money from the owners of the private asylums. The five officers were severely censured by the chairman, with the unanimous approval of the whole board of guardians that day assembled. The board of guardians, after censuring the officers, remitted their case to the Local Government Board for its consideration, and I am under the impression that if the Local Government Board does its duty it ought to dismiss, or call upon the board of guardians to dismiss, these men. Certainly I should press for their dismissal on the ground that there is nothing which the public are more touchy about than the proper treatment of lunatics, and that in this particular branch of the public administration no temptation or bribe should be offered to the officers.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask the hon. Member how he connects the matter he refers to with the administration of the Lunacy Commissioners.

*MR. JOHN BURNS: In this way: there is a feeling that the practice that I complain of is somewhat general. One of the guardians said it was a matter of custom, and that it was generally done by most of the relieving officers throughout the metropolis; and I want to say that if that is so the Lunacy Commissioners ought to inquire what the effect of a system of this kind is of causing the owners of private asylums to induce officers to transfer lunatics for profit to these private asylums, whether they are kept longer than they need be, after being cured, instead of being handed over to their relatives. It seems to me that if the Lunacy Commissioners make inquiry they will find that the effect of this system is such as I have described. Whether that is so or not is not to be determined at this moment; but I believe that nearly everyone is dissatisfied with the present method of certification, although there is no feeling against the certifying officers. It is the belief that these things are more general than is supposed, and the attention of the Lunacy Commissioners should be directed to an inquiry as to whether the system does not extend to other branches of the administration of the Lunacy laws. I respectfully request the Attorney General to ask the Lunacy Commissioners to make special investigation in this case to see whether, to any extent, this practice has permeated other branches of the Department, and whether it is the case that lunatics are retained in private asylums when to the profit of the ratepayers and to the advantage of the lunatics themselves and their friends, they should be discharged. I shall be only too pleased to place the whole of the facts in the hands of the Attorney General, but I should prefer that he should ask one of the Lunacy Commissioners to see whether these have any bearing on the administration of the Lunacy Laws generally. If he does that I know he will do everything in his power to satisfy public opinion that, in so far as the Lunacy Commissioners are concerned, they do not countenance anything of the kind.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): There is no doubt whatever that the circumstances of the case to which the hon. Member has called attention in the statement he has brought before the Committee are of a very serious character. If the facts are correctly reported to the hon. Member, they disclose an offence of a very serious kind committed not only by the relieving officers, but by those who are alleged to have bribed them. I hope the hon. Gentleman is mistaken in supposing that the practice is common. It would be a very serious matter indeed if so scandalous a thing should be at all general as that officers should be bribed by the owners of private lunatic asylums for the purpose of sending lunatics to these asylums rather than sending them to public lunatic asylums, where they would be better treated. Of course, the Lunacy Commissioners cannot be for one moment suspected of looking with anything but the utmost disfavour on a practice of the kind referred to by the hon. Member. I can only assure the hon. Member that we shall exercise the greatest care in investigating the managements of these establishments where such practices have prevailed, and in any case which is brought to our notice we shall act with the utmost vigour.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: The statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General is a very satisfactory one, but the object of my hon. friend was mainly to call the attention of the Lunacy Commissioners to what has been a very great scandal. It is a monstrous thing for officials to receive these bribes, aad it is still more monstrous for private lunatic asylum owners to give them. I think myself that, as a rule, wherever there is a chance of sending pauper lunatics to a public asylum, it is the best thing to do, and they should not be sent to a private asylum. I think the greater part of this business should come under the purview of the Local Government Board.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.): We in St. Pancras feel very much obliged to the hon. Gentleman for bringing this matter forward. At present the question is before the Local Government Board, and no doubt full investigation will take place.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have received from the right hon. Gentleman the courteous and kind answer that I should expect. But I think the disclosures in St. Pancras give an opportunity for a review of the system of pauper lunatics and the way in which they are transferred. I am content with the discussion which has taken place, and do not propose to move a reduction.

Vote agreed to.

6. £67, to complete the sum for the Mint, including Coinage.

LORD BALCARRES: I wish to take this opportunity of drawing attention to the manner in which the designing of the South African war medal has been undertaken by the Mint. We have in this country a number of extremely brilliant medallists, among whom are Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Brock, and Mr. Frampton, who are capable of designing artistic war medals. But hitherto the bulk of the war medals have been more fit to be coachmen's buttons than displayed on the manly breasts of our soldiers. In the case of the medal for South Africa the authorities of the Mint, rather than allow it to be submitted to open competition, have hurried the work through with undue haste; and, without asserting that the medal will be badly done, I think that greater care should have been taken to ensure an entirely worthy production.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I do not agree with the hon. Member that there has been hurry in the matter, so far as the authorities of the Mint are concerned. The arrangements for the issue of war medals rest with the War Office, and naturally the Secretary for War was anxious that measures should be taken as soon as possible for the designing and production of the South African medal. I do not think that anybody can fairly complain of the designs of the medals issued by the Mint. I do not profess to be a connoisseur, but I certainly think the recent Jubilee medal, for instance, was a medal of which no country need be ashamed. The new war medal is by the same designer, and although I have not seen it I feel sure it will be found not to deserve condemnation.

LORD BALCARRES: Is it to be designed by the Mint, or by Mr. Brock?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: By the designer to the Mint.

Vote agreed to.

7. £8,097, to complete the sum for National Debt Office.

8. £12,838, to complete the sum for Public Record Office.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) said he wished to draw attention to the fact that nothing had been done towards appointing a person to the Record Office who was conversant with Welsh history and Welsh literature, to calendar and index documents relating to Wales. Wales had a splendid system of education, but it did not possess a proper text-book on Welsh history to put in the hands of the students. Ample materials for such a work lay uncatalogued in the Record Office. There was no need for the appointment of an expert. The desirable thing was the selection of a young Welsh scholar, straightway, say, from the University to fill the first vacancy that arose in the office. The authorities there would train him up in their methods, and eventually he might be set to do this special work for the adequate treatment of historical records bearing on Wales. The right hon. Gentleman had already promised to consider this question, and he earnestly hoped the wishes of Wales in this matter would be realised.

MR. HANBURY said he agreed to a very considerable extent with the hon. Member, and thought a Welshman should be appointed to the Record Office. There was no doubt a vast amount of work which would not be properly done by an Englishman, and when the next vacancy occurred he would see how far he could carry out the wishes of the hon. Gentleman by appointing some Welshman to the position. That was a course he would gladly avail himself of.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said all Welsh Members accepted the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman, and were very much obliged to him. There were in the Record Office many Welsh documents of great importance which were not catalogued, so that Welsh students were unable to put their hands upon them. He thought the appointment of a Welshman in the Record Office would confer a lasting benefit on the Welsh people.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN acknowledged the sympathetic manner in which the right hon. Gentleman had met the hon. Member for North Carnarvonshire, but regretted that students were unable under the present conditions, owing to the absence of text-books, to study the history of Wales.

Vote agreed to.

9. £15, to complete the sum for Public Works Loan Commission.

MR. BUCHANAN commented on the fact that this Vote in the last few years had undergone great changes. A few years previously the nominal figure was £7,000, in the present Vote the Government only asked for £15. The demand for loans had enormously increased, and he would like to obtain some assurance that in view of the enormous increase in the business of the Department of the Public Works Loan Commissioners, and in the receipts from fees, the Department would consider the possibility of considerably abating the fees exacted from local authorities and others who asked for the issue of loans for public purposes.

MR. HANBURY thought the hon. Gentleman's point was to a very great extent met by the abatement which the Treasury now made in its demands on the fund for the general expenses of administration.

Vote agreed to.

10. £23,702, to complete the sum for Registrar General's Office, England.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I had on the Notice Paper a motion to reduce this Vote by £100, but I think it will now be unnecessary to move it, inasmuch as I have received what I can only regard as a satisfactory assurance from the Under Secretary of the Local Government Board. My object in putting down this motion was to obtain a perfectly satisfactory record of the population of Wales in the course of the coming census. I regret that that census is to be of so limited a character. I cannot go into that question, because it has already been the subject of legislation in this House. I can only express the hope that the mistakes which were admittedly made during the last census —administrative mistakes I mean—will be avoided in the coming census so far as the population of Wales and Monmouthshire are concerned. I trust that proper forms will be supplied containing a language column, and that we shall have nothing further to complain of in that respect.

Vote agreed to.

11. £350,060, to complete the sum for Stationery and Printing.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: I am not quite sure whether the point I am about to raise comes properly under this Vote. The question I wish to raise is that of the reporting in this House. It is a comparatively small matter, and it does not affect the public service very materially. It does affect hon. Members themselves. I notice that the recent reports of our debates are in the first person, and very admirable reports they seem to be; but, on the other hand, they are by no means verbatim reports. I think the general notion is that when you see a report in the first person it is understood to be verbatim. It seems to me desirable that there should be no ambiguity about this, because occasionally *Hansard* is referred to as an authority as to the *ipsissima verba* of what hon. Members have said, and I would suggest, therefore, that it would be better either to have a note to the effect that the reports are not verbatim, or else that they should be in the third person and not in the first. There is another point in regard to the Pink Paper we are now receiving with reports of the inquiries made under a recent Act with respect to charities. In every case on the Pink Paper there are twelve lines of print stating the formal terms. It seems to me that too many details are given.

MR. HANBURY: As to the Pink Paper, that is a matter for the authorities of the House. With regard to the reports, of course the hon. Member knows that although most of the speeches are in the first person there is a great distinction to be drawn between speeches which have an asterisk showing that the Member has himself corrected the proofs of the speech, and those speeches which have no such asterisk. Probably the great majority of Members are content to leave their speeches without an asterisk. It is somewhat unfortunate, having corrected a speech and having an asterisk attached to it, that it can be brought up as a record against you hereafter, and, for my own part, I carefully avoid ever doing so. I quite agree with the hon. Member that when the report of a speech purports to be verbatim we want practically the whole speech, because it does lead to the impression that the speech as reported is the whole of what the hon. Member has said. One does not like passages which may have been important left out of the report of a speech which purports to be verbatim. I confess that the matter rests to a great extent with the reporters and with the publishers of *Hansard*, but I myself look back with regret to the days when the great majority of the speeches were in the third person. I know that there were objections raised in the House to the fact that most of the speeches were taken from the reports of *The Times*, and that those speeches were not in the first person. Although there were more or less technical objections to that system I thought it was quite the best system in which the reports were published, and I would not be sorry to see the House go back to that plan, because we undoubtedly got very excellent reports under that system. We got reports with which the majority of Members were thoroughly well satisfied, and the only objection that was ever raised, that I know of, to that system was that we were allowing the contractor to sub-let his contract. On that ground, which I do not think is a very important one, objections were raised in the House, and we were forced to adopt the present system. I shall mention to the editor of *Hansard* the point raised by the hon. Gentleman, because I think there is something in the statement that if a speech is reported in the first person then the whole of the speech ought to be given *in extenso*. Any influence which I can bring to bear on the reporters will be brought to go back to the old system of reporting in the third person, with the exception of particular speeches of particular Members and Ministers, whose speeches the House would wish to have reported in the first person.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I am extremely glad that the hon. Member has brought forward this question as to verbatim reporting. Hon. Members and those who read the speeches in this House are greatly interested in the matter of verbatim reporting. Those who only utter a few short words are not so much interested. I would point out to hon. Members themselves that verbatim reporting would be a great disfigurement to the reports, because we would get a number of interruptions and inelegancies, such as no Member would like to see opposite to his name in so important a publication as *Hansard*; but if you are not to have an absolutely verbatim report you must have a summary report. That cannot be done by the same man who does the verbatim report. The verbatim report is done by a common shorthand reporter, who takes down what he hears, and just gives a photograph of what he takes down. When you come to summarising a speech you require a very expert reporter. In the first place, he must have some knowledge of the subject he is reporting, and be able, more or less, to bring to his work a sense of proportion, and know that which is important and that which is unimportant. For instance, when he hears ten good arguments and three bad jokes, he should not leave out the ten good arguments and put in the three bad jokes. I have known the arguments omitted and the jokes inserted. Therefore it comes to this—that for verbatim reporting a common shorthand writer will do, but when you come to a summary such as my hon. friend suggests, you require no longer a shorthand reporter but a Parliamentary expert. That is the sort of reporter we used to have. *The Times* reporters and those who reported the debates when I first entered the House were undoubtedly experts, and they conferred the greatest possible benefit on Members by what they did. They left out the poor, stale, irrelevant stuff, and they left in the sapient arguments and the permanent points of the debate. But this involves large expense. You cannot have reporters of great ability and historical knowledge without going to expense; indeed, I think the mistake the Secretary of the Treasury makes is in trying to get the work done too cheaply. That, I think, is at the bottom of the matter. If he had been content to go on paying for the old system we should still have had the old style of reports. One word as to the present reporting. I have heard the most scathing language used with respect to the present reports by no less a person than the President of the Local Government Board. The right hon. Gentleman, speaking with the amplitude of manner which always fascinates the House, and makes us listen to his longest sentences—and they are sometimes long—denounced and repudiated, with all the force of which a Cabinet Minister is capable, the reports at present given of his speeches. He said he would not be responsible for any report in *Hansard* of a speech of his. When they are quoted against him he says he will have nothing to do with them. Then we have the corroborative evidence of the Secretary of the Treasury. He knows so well what stuff the reports are made of that he also will have no truck with them, nor will he correct them and put an asterisk, which suggests that they are more or less accurate. I am in exactly the same case. When I look at the proofs of the reports occasionally sent to me, and which profess to be a more or less accurate rendering of the few remarks I have addressed to the House, I am amazed to see my millions and metaphors, my quotations and facts, jumbled up in an absolute jangle of words. It is a farrago. I am perfectly certain that I never uttered the words attributed to me, but I go further, and say that I cannot conceive how any man could imagine that any other man ever uttered them. Our reports are not merely bad, absolutely misleading, completely untrustworthy, but comic. I am glad to find that the prodigal son is coming back repentant from the husks, and if he will revert to the old system, as I believe he is inclined to do, of the expert Parliamentary reporter with a knowledge of Parliamentary usages, some knowledge of Parliamentary questions and the art of condensing, which, of course, will involve extra cost, I promise that I, for one, will kill the fatted calf for him.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): It is surely unnecessary that every time a Member asks a question which has appeared in the Orders, and which he has no right to correct, the question should be sent to him. It appears to me there must be a great deal of trouble and expense in sending out matter to which there is no objection whatever.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I wish to express my sympathy with what has been said with regard to reporting in the first person. But I do not want to make any complaint. The right hon. Gentleman has promised to look into the question, whether first or third person reports should be given. May I ask that no alteration should be made in the style of the reports during the present session?

CAPTAIN PHILLPOTTS (Devonshire, Torquay): I merely rise to support the appeal made by the hon. Member for King's Lynn. I think there is one other matter of complaint, and that is in connection with the time taken before the reports are published. It does not matter so much with regard to the debates as the questions. There is often so much conversation going on at the time of questions that it is frequently impossible to hear the answer made by a Minister, and before the reports are published it is sometimes too late to refer back to the information desired. There is another point I wish to mention, and that is the position the official reporters occupy in the House. In another place the official reporters are in the body of the House, where they have a good opportunity of hearing what is said. In this House they are in the gallery, and I have every reason to believe that they sometimes do not hear what is said, and they labour under a disadvantage that might be remedied. I hope my right hon. friend will take that into consideration.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £13,439 be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Her Majesty's Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, and of the Office of Land Revenue Records and Inrolments."

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to a charge of £444 made by the Woods and Forests Department to the Committee of the North Wales Lunatic Asylum at Denbigh. The asylum required a new water supply, and for that purpose the level of a small lake had to be raised a few feet. To make the title of the asylum authorities clear, certain mineral rights, which belonged to the Crown, had to be acquired. The Asylum Committee expected that, as such rights were of merely nominal value, the Office of Woods and Forests would only charge a nominal sum for them, but the price they named was £500. Afterwards on the representations of the committee they reduced the charge to £444. The committee was entirely at the mercy of the Woods and Forests Department, and they have been obliged to assent to this, but they have the right, as representing the ratepayers of Anglesey, Carnarvonshire, Denbighshire, Flintshire, and Merionethshire, to appeal to the Treasury and to Parliament for a further substantial reduction. The only possible minerals or stones that can be taken into consideration are lead, flags, building and road stone. As to lead, the formation is Wenlock shale, which is almost always very barren in mineral veins, and for many miles around the reservoir, as the geological charts show, is without any indication of the presence of lead or other metals. Flags are worked in the parish of Nantglyn, at some distance from the reservoir, but in places that are very difficult of access. At the reservoir the conditions are quite different; an excellent road, the old turnpike between Denbigh and Pentrevoelas, runs beside the lake. If there were any flags worth quarrying such facilities of removal would not have been neglected, and it may be assumed that no such flags exist there. As to building and road stone, there is no building in the neighbourhood, and the stone is of such poor quality that the last house built was erected of wood and iron, although built on freehold land. For road purposes the stone is extremely bad. When used it is quickly pulverised or reduced to a pasty mud. The borough road surveyor has declined to take any of the stone which may be quarried in making the reservoir, on the ground that it is useless for road purposes. The stone is worthless, minerals do not exist, and the Department, bearing in mind that it is dealing with a public authority in which five of the counties of North Wales are interested, might very well have conveyed for a nominal consideration the mineral rights which had to be purchased for the sake of raising the level of the lake. If those mineral rights had been offered for sale by public auction I doubt whether anyone would have made any offer whatever for them. I do not complain that the Office of Woods and Forests are now far more careful of the public interest than they have been in the past, when some of the finest mineral properties in the kingdom were jobbed away to individuals. Anyone who has read the Report of the Deputy Ranger of the Forest of Snowdon upon the shameful misappropriation of Crown lands must rejoice that the state of things which was described fifty years ago has passed away, not, however, without depriving the nation of nearly all the really valuable Crown property. But nowadays, in dealing with public authorities, I fear they are running to another extreme. This is a case in which one public authority has another public authority at its mercy. The object in view is not the advantage of an individual, but the good of the community. I ask the Treasury to take a juster view of this case, and not to charge more for these worthless mineral rights than £44, a sum which far exceeds their real value. In Wales we have 84,000 acres of waste land. That land, of course, is subject to commonal rights. Of course, the rights of commoners ought to be fully considered, and no one wishes to interfere with them without compensation; but what I complain of is that the Woods and Forests Department are taking no steps in the direction of dealing with these lands. It would be possible for them to acquire a very large amount of land at a very small outlay indeed by purchasing the commonal rights over a sufficient area for the purpose of planting. It would beautify the country, add to the national wealth, and give employment to a large number of men at the very time of the year when employment is most needed. I am astonished that the Woods and Forests Department have not done something in this direction. They have, it is true, made a small experiment in planting in Merionethshire, but if that is to be treated as an experiment in planting, I suppose thirty or forty years will elapse before it is concluded. The County Council of Northumberland have realised the value of re-afforesting land, and if the Woods and Forests Department would only apply some portion of the large surplus which they annually surrender to the Treasury they would be able to use their own money, and in that way increase very largely indeed the national wealth. There was a time when Wales was covered with forests of valuable timber. I am sorry to say that the country has been denuded very largely of these magnificent oak forests, which were at one time our pride and our glory. They were used to build the British Navy, and at one time "the wooden walls of Old England" consisted almost entirely of Welsh timber. That has been denied, but I have irrefutable evidence of it. The greatest interest was taken in Wales in the Navy, not because the people had relatives or friends in that service, but because they knew the particular estate on which the timber used for such and such a ship was grown. It would take a very long time to restore those magnificent oak forests. The landowners are doing what they can in this direction, but a public Department is in a very different position from a private landowner, who does not wish to lock up his money in timber. A public Department could easily invest money in this very desirable object. This will be a much more important question in future than it is at present. Employment is now fairly plentiful, but the time will come when we shall hear the cry of the unemployed once more, and another generation will praise the foresight of the right hon. Gentleman if he now presses on the Woods and Forests Department the necessity of at once setting on foot this great national reform. If the Woods and Forests Department would commence this work we should have some hope that at all events some of the 2½ million acres of waste land in this country would be reafforested. We spend 18 million pounds a year on imported timber, and I believe that if only a portion of our waste lands were planted we could supply ourselves with all the timber we now require, or are likely to require for some time to come. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will do something in the direction I have indicated, and that he will, at all events, apply some of the money which is received year after year from the Crown lands towards beautifying the country, and towards providing a new source of revenue to the State and a new means of employment for the people.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I can corroborate what my hon. friend has said, especially with reference to the first point he raised. The district concerned is in my own constituency, and I have therefore had many opportunities of becoming acquainted with the feeling of the public in regard to this particular matter. I desire to pay a very high tribute to the Commissioner of Woods and Forests for the sympathetic way in which he has conducted his negotiations with regard to Crown property in England and Wales. Up to this time he has shown from the very outset a strong desire to become thoroughly acquainted with the local conditions in each case, and we feel very much indebted to him for the spirit in which he has carried out the work of his Department. With regard to the particular matter mentioned, all I would say is that, knowing the place and the conditions, I thoroughly concur with the view expressed by my hon. friend. No doubt it has been said that a competent inspector was sent down to report on the value of these particular minerals, but the true test is not what was the price obtained for similar rights in other parts of the country, but what was the actual value of these minerals; not what they would be worth if they were worked in the future, but whether they ever had been worked or were likely to be worked. The answer to these two questions is in the negative. These minerals have never been worked, and are not likely to be worked. I feel strongly that a mistake has been made in this particular case. I only wish to emphasize one other point made by my hon. friend. Surely some difference ought to be made between striking a bargain with a public institution and striking a bargain with a private individual. I hope, at all events, that the result of this debate will be that the matter will be investigated, and that, at all events, an arrangement of this kind will not be repeated.

CAPTAIN JESSEL: I desire to make an appeal to the Secretary to the Treasury with reference to the enclosures in Regent's Park. The Committee may not be aware of the fact that there are in the Park several houses having large gardens, and a rumour, which I believe is based on a good deal of truth, is afloat that the Commissioners of Woods and Forests have been approached on the subject of giving these villa gardens an extension of lease. This question is not a new one. In 1880 the then First Commissioner of Works was approached by a deputation with reference to the subscription gardens in Regent's Park, and the result was that these gardens were cut down from fourteen acres to seven acres. In the course of an investigation it was discovered that the leases of the land surrounding these villas were only held on a yearly tenancy, and a compromise was effected which resulted in certain portions of the ground being given back, and, on the other hand, the interests of the landowners were secured for the remainder of the tenancy. The other leases were granted as far back as 1822 and 1826 for a period of ninety-nine years, and although, of course, that period has not yet come to an end, yet the leaseholders, like prudent men, are trying to get a renewal of their leases. I need hardly say how very important it is to the public, especially of the district I represent, that as much of Regent's Park as possible should be open to them. Some thirty-two acres are now held by villa-owners. Not long ago deputations approached the First Commissioner of Works with reference to cricket and football grounds in Regent's Park. I had the privilege of accompanying one of the most important deputations, and it was stated that no less than 6,000 persons used Regent's Park for the purposes of cricket and football, and it was pointed out how extremely small the ground allotted for that purpose was. It seems to me that if anything can be done to increase the ground available for the public it would be a very good thing. Of course the Commissioners of Woods and Forests may urge the objection that they will lose the revenue now derived from these villa gardens; but I venture to appeal to the Secretary to the Treasury on behalf of London, and especially on behalf of St. Pancras and Marylebone, not to allow these leases to be extended without the sanction of Parliament. I can assure him that if he will give us an undertaking that this matter shall be thoroughly gone into before the leases are extended, it will be received with gratitude.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I desire to associate myself with the excellent remarks of the hon. Member for South St. Pancras. I come to this subject rather fresh, having spent two days of my Whitsun holiday in visiting Regent's Park and making observations with a view to supporting the hon. Member in the object he has in view. It seems to me that we ought to remind the Secretary to the Treasury, who for the moment represents the Woods and Forests Department, that there is a pretty well-grounded opinion in the North of London that a serious attempt is going to be made to have these leases renewed, and also to extend the annual tenancy of the land immediately outside the house property. I believe there will be such an attempt, because the value of these houses is very tempting, and the owners will make every effort within their power to extend the period of their occupancy. The Crown derives £14,444 a year from the land occupied by these private houses. That is a small amount as compared with the value this land would be to the public in the neighbourhood if it were turned into a recreation ground for the enjoyment of young and old. The hon. Member for South St. Pancras with characteristic moderation did not make his case as strong as he might have made it. In going into the documents I find that the situation as between the public enjoyment of Regent's Park and the private privilege user of about a dozen people who are inside the gates of the park is as follows. The park has 472 acres of ground; of that 129 acres, or twenty-four per cent. of the total acreage, is either owned by private people, or enjoyed by associations of a semi-private or a semi-public character, whichever way you put it. I venture to say that, however expedient it may have been ninety years ago to have allowed twenty-four per cent. of the total acreage of the park to be given to private individuals, a similar condition of things does not exist to-day, and that the pressure of population in St. Pancras, Islington, and Marylebone warrants us in demanding that as soon as the leases of the houses expire and the annual tenancies fall in they shall not be renewed, and that the whole of this 129 acres, or as much of it as does not subserve any public interest, shall be thrown into the park. The Zoological Gardens has thirty-one acres, and there are some people who believe that the Zoological Gardens ought to pay more than £358 per annum for having that institution inside Regent's Park. The Botanical Gardens, which do not altogether satisfy the public, have eighteen acres, the Toxophilites have six acres, and the pleasure gardens have over eight acres. That is to say, four semi-public associations have sixty-three acres out of the 129 acres. I think that the Botanical Gardens might come under more public control than they now have, and I think that the Toxophilites might be allowed to disappear. With regard to the pleasure gardens, I see no reason why they should be continued, and I venture to think that some of the people using them would willingly part with their share for the greater enjoyment of the public. Now I come to the remainder. What are the facts? I find that Grove Lodge has four acres, Hanover Lodge four acres, North Lodge two acres, Baptist College nine acres, St. Dunstan's Villa—the tenant of which, I believe, is a very excellent citizen, and a man who has given excellent service to the State—twelve acres, St. Catherine's House five acres, St. John's Lodge—formerly occupied, I believe, by a Member of this House—twelve acres; then there is a place known as The Holme, five acres, and South Villa eleven acres. Altogether nine gentlemen occupy sixty-four acres of ground inside Regent's Park, for which they pay the Government £1,444 per annum. What does that area represent? It represents a Green Park, or seven Kennington Ovals. What does that mean? St. Pancras borders on one side of Regent's Park, and there is no district in London where overcrowding is greater, and no place where open spaces are more needed. I consider that the hon. Member for South St. Pancras has made out a very strong case for this area being added to the park. Now I come to the owners. No injustice can be done to them, because eighty-five and ninety-three years ago the then owners took the houses and the grounds on leasehold conditions. They knew very well that when the leases expired they would have no claim upon the Government for an extension. What is more, I venture to say that the quietude and the enjoyment which the occupants have derived by ninety years occupancy of houses so beautifully situated is all the compensation that can reasonably be expected. I should suggest that as the leases fall in the gardens and the houses should be added to the park for the health and athletic advantages of the immediate neighbourhood. Some will ask, is there any reason for this? The first of these leases will fall in in ten years, and I shudder when I think what the condition of St. Pancras will be in ten years if overcrowding continues as at present. I believe it is the duty of the Woods and Forests Department to anticipate the still more crowded condition of St. Pancras which will prevail at that period by seeing that when these leases expire the ground shall be added to the park. One has noticed with great pleasure what the City Corporation has done for open spaces with regard to Epping Forest. Years ago people said that there were 6,000 acres of land in Epping Forest and that there was no one near it. What have we witnessed? The growth of population in the direction of Epping Forest has converted it into a place used to-day quite as much as Hyde Park, Battersea Park, or Kensington Gardens was used thirty years ago. So great is the demand on Epping Forest that we find Sir Edward Buxton and other public-spirited gentlemen still adding to the total acreage available to the public. The securing for the public of Epping Forest is one of the finest acts every accomplished by the City Corporation. Take, for instance, what Her Majesty has done. The Queen, very much to her credit, and I believe the people of London appreciate it, has handed Kensington Palace and grounds and Kew Cottage grounds over to the public, and also a house in Greenwich Park for the advantage of the people in that neighbourhood. Wherever we go we see that parks which were formerly the private property of the Queen have been handed over by her to the public. She has given increased access to her houses, castles, and private parks and gardens, which are still exclusively her own. We also find that the Archbishop of Canterbury has handed over eleven acres of his land in the Lambeth Palace grounds to the London County Council for the benefit of the poor children living in the slums of Lambeth. I congratulate the Queen and the Archbishop of Canterbury upon doing these generous things. We also find the City Corporation vieing with the London County Council in providing open spaces for London, but the only people who are not following the example of the Queen, the Archbishop, the City Corporation, and the London County Council are these nine or ten privileged leaseholders in Regent's Park. I wish the right hon. Gentleman would take a hint from the Member for South St. Pancras, and give these leaseholders notice that we do not intend to renew their leases. They are not wanted inside Regent's Park, and I should say that the borders of the forest, or near Windsor Park, would better suit their temperament. We want this land in Regent's Park for the general public and the children of the immediate neighbourhood. The people have asked the Member for South St. Pancras to make this request, and I cordially support him. When we find that the Brixton people themselves can raise £60,000 for the addition of forty-two acres to Brockwell Park, surely we ought, when we are able to do it by a mere movement of the pen, to give these leaseholders notice to terminate their leases, and thus add 129 more acres to one of the finest parks in London, which is not large enough, and which could be made larger by terminating the private privileges which have gone on too long, and which could be done without injustice to the tenants and much to the advantage of the people of St. Pancras and of London generally.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that this particular source of revenue was not in the same position as other sources. The Woods and Forests and Crown lands were the remains of what was once the personal property of the Sovereign, and at the beginning of every reign they returned to the Sovereign, when a fresh bargain had to be made, the Sovereign receiving the Civil List in return. It was a matter of bargain, and if at any time the Sovereign refused to make the bargain then all this property went back into the personal possession of the Sovereign. He only mentioned this to show that this particular property stood on an entirely different footing to other property. Her Majesty's Ministers were simply trustees during the present reign, and it was their duty to see that it was handed over to the successor of the Queen. Therefore, Her Majesty's Ministers had not the same free hand in the matter as they had in regard to other property, and they could only deal with these lands in a purely fiduciary character. There was one very peculiar feature about this Vote, and it was that they were asked to vote £21,000 for the expenses of the Office of Woods and Forests, when there were really no expenses at all. On the contrary, the State derived a revenue from these woods and forests. There was another remarkable feature; the Office of Woods and Forests was the only Department which was allowed to pay its own expenses, and hand over to the Treasury the balance. If hon. Members would turn to page 24 of the Financial Statement, they would see a more or less detailed account of the revenues of the Office of Woods and Forests. The total revenue was £605,000 up to 1899, and out of that they retained £111,000. This property was in an entirely different situation to any other property belonging to the State, and the revenue was treated differently. Now the Committee was called upon to vote £21,000. Out of the £111,000 retained they kept £15,000 for salaries, and in addition the Committee were called upon for this Vote to meet incidental expenses.

CAPTAIN JESSEL said there was no wish that the Treasury should rob the Crown. What was desired was that they should not come to a decision yet, and that public bodies might know what these lands would cost, and have an opportunity to buy.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that this matter could not be dealt with in the same spirit of generosity as might be exercised in other matters where unfettered control existed. Here they were trustees for the Crown, and not only for the present possessors, but for future possessors. It had been said that some of this property had been sold at a very high price for the purpose of erecting public offices. But if anything less than the absolute full price had been exacted he should have complained. In regard to Regent's Park, that question was capable of being treated with justice on both sides. He was sure that none of them desired to rob the Crown, but there were many difficulties connected with anything like generous treatment, on account of the position in which the property stood.

MR. BUCHANAN: I do not wish to go into the history of this Vote, which has been dealt with by my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn, but I wish to bring before the right hon. Gentleman another question. England and Wales have their grievances on this Vote, and so has Scotland. It is a question which I have brought before the House on several occasions, and it is that the Office of Woods and Forests have, within recent years, resumed the practice which this House got them to discontinue many years ago of selling Crown rights of salmon fishing in the sea off the coast of Scotland. The Office of Woods and Forests sold some time ago some Crown rights of salmon fishing on the west coast of Scotland. When the question was brought up in this House great pressure was put upon the Government, and the present First Lord of the Admiralty, who was then the Chancellor of the Exchequer, agreed that this sale of the Crown rights of salmon fishing should be discontinued. That was in the year 1886, and for ten years onwards from that time none of these Crown rights of salmon fishing in the sea in Scotland were sold by the Office of Woods and Forests. I believe the legal rights in regard to salmon fishing in the sea are different in Scotland to what they are in England. If a Scotch fisherman catches a salmon in the sea it does not become his property, and if he brings it ashore he can be brought before the Court for having it in his possession. The only public rights of salmon fishing in the sea off the coast of Scotland are those which remain in the Office of Woods and Forests. Therefore, in Scotland, we are exceedingly jealous of parting definitely with any of these rights. We are not averse to leasing those rights, as we have done from year to year, but we have always steadfastly resisted any attempt to part with those valuable public rights. When these sales were resumed in 1896 two were sold, and last year two other valuable rights were also parted with. When I asked the question in this House I was told by the Secretary to the

Treasury, or some other representative of the Government, that those sales were of an exceptional nature. From further inquiries we gathered that the title to those rights was believed to be somewhat uncertain, but that is an argument which points in various directions. It might be argued that the Crown should not part with property to which there is an uncertain title, but what I want to urge is that there are substantial public rights involved to which great importance is attached in Scotland, and that they should not be absolutely parted with on any consideration whatever. They are public rights which we cherish very considerably, and we ought to have from the Office of Woods and Forests a fuller statement than we have hitherto obtained of the grounds upon which they have gone back upon the policy previously sanctioned by the Government. In order to bring the matter to a point I beg to move the reduction of this Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £13,339, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

MR. HANBURY: This is not the first time that the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire has raised this question, for he has put questions in the House more than once upon this subject, and the answer of the Office of Woods and Forests is exactly what the hon. Member has stated. They say that the Commissioners have parted with no public rights in salmon fisheries except in two or three cases where the public rights have been extremely doubtful. I understand that that is not denied by the hon. Member, but what he seems to object to is the action of the Commissioners in parting with property as to the title to which there is some doubt. That appears to be the whole difference, but on this question we accept the statement of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. The hon. Member for Flint has raised two questions. He first referred to the purchase of some mineral rights by an asylum authority in North Wales from the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, and he complains of the price. That price was, I think, £2 an acre for about 220 acres, and he says that nothing ought to have been paid for those mineral rights, because they are worthless. In the opinion of the Chief Inspector of Minerals there was at any rate a possibility that there might be minerals there of some value, and the asylum authorities themselves offered the sum of £400 for these very mineral rights. Therefore, the difference on which the hon. Member raises this question is one merely of £44 between the price charged by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests and the price offered by the asylum authorities. That difference is not a very serious one, and what was done by the Commissioners was done on the advice of their own mining expert. The other point raised is that of the afforestation of the hills in Wales. With regard to the unenclosed lands very serious difficulties are encountered owing to the fact that there are certain common rights connected with them, and unless the whole of the common rights are bought up it is impossible to do anything of an effective nature. With regard to the enclosed portions, most of them are lands which pay much better under tillage than they would under timber. But no doubt there are certain portions where, in the opinion of the Commissioners, it is desirable to do some planting. I think that only within the last six months they have purchased three farms in Merionethshire for the purpose, and so far as is possible the suggestion of the hon. Member will be followed. I come now to the question raised by my hon. friend the Member for South St. Pancras and the hon. Member for Battersea. I was glad to hear the statement made by my hon. friend behind me in the shape of an interruption during the speech of the hon. Member for King's Lynn. I gathered from his first statement that he was anxious that the Crown lands in Regent's Park should be devoted to public local purposes, without any price being paid for them. I now understand that that is not his view. If you take this land in Regent's Park and say that the enclosed portion shall be thrown open to the public, that would be finding an additional park for a certain portion of London at the cost of the taxpayer, and that is a policy which we deliberately refused to adopt some years ago. Certain parks which had been up to that period maintained at the cost of the taxpayer have now fallen upon the local ratepayer, and I do not quite know why the district surrounding Regent's

Park should be made any exception to that rule. Even Battersea Park is now a charge upon the local rates and not upon the general taxpayer. After all, what is the history of Regent's Park? It shows that it is not a Royal park in the sense that Hyde Park is a Royal park. It does not come under the Act of 1810, and it is entirely in the same position as the property of the ordinary Crown lands, and that being so, of course it has to be treated on exactly the same principle. It is only right that the Crown should derive revenue from these lands. It is said that a certain portion of Regent's Park has been for some time thrown open to the public, and it seems to be argued that on this account the remainder of the property should also be thrown open to the public. As a matter of fact it is only within the present century, at any rate, that the public have had the right of entry upon any portion of it whatever; and with regard to the remainder, no portion which is now enclosed and leased to private holders was ever, so far as I understand it, open to the public. So that the present is an entirely fresh demand in respect to Crown lands which have never been open to the public to be thrown open to the public in future. Of course that would raise very serious difficulties between the taxpayers and the Crown. The hon. Member for King's Lynn has stated with perfect correctness what is the history of the arrangement between the Crown and the public with regard to these lands, and it is in the interests of the public that revenue should be derived from Crown lands. The point raised by my hon. friend is, I think, a fair one. He does not say that these lands ought to be given to the public, or the local public, without any consideration being paid, and he admits that a fair price ought to be paid. I understand his argument to be that in the choice of tenants preference should be given to local authorities, or to tenants of a more or less public and representative character. With regard to the houses and grounds surrounding Regent's Park, that question does not now arise, because none of these leases will fall in before the year 1916, or between 1916 and 1930. I have certainly heard of no attempt being made to extend those leases. I think, however, when we do get the opportunity it will be wise for the Commissioners to see how far, without detriment to the revenue of the Crown, the public might have more access to certain portions of Regent's Park. With regard to the Zoological Gardens, I think it will be generally admitted that the throwing open of those gardens conferred a great benefit, and the public derive great advantage from this privilege. In the case of the Botanical Gardens, I understand that the lease will come to an end very shortly—whether next year or the year after I am not quite sure. I think—and it is also the view of the Commissioners—that steps should be taken to see that the public have more interest in that institution in the future than they have had in the past. Hitherto these gardens have been closed to the public altogether, and I do not think that the public have had the right of admission to them even upon payment. I think it would be only a fair condition in any new lease which is granted that admission should be permitted to the public upon the payment of a reasonable sum upon two or three days in each week.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I regret that the right hon. Gentleman found it necessary to defend the action of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests with reference to the case of the North Wales Lunatic Asylum. It is not a question of their exacting the market value of this particular plot of ground, because if it went on the market I do not suppose they would ever get a penny for the mineral rights. They discovered that the asylums committee were under the necessity of obtaining this land, and they took advantage of a public necessity in order to exact a sum of money greater than the value of the land. I cannot take the view of the hon. Member for King's Lynn that in any case the Commissioners ought to administer the land under their control as if it were a private estate. That is taking a too narrow and selfish view of their functions. But they have gone beyond what might be expected of a private individual by taking advantage of the necessity of a public institution to exact a large sum of money from a public institution. I regret that the right hon. Gentleman has found it necessary to defend such a spirit. I must say, however, that there has been a great improvement within the last few years in the manner in which the

Commissioners have met the local authorities in Wales, and I regret that they departed from that line of action when they came to deal with the North Wales Asylum Committee. With regard to the statement that the sum of £400 had been offered by the committee, I can hardly think that that is the case. I think the right hon. Gentleman must have been misinformed, because I hold a copy of a letter written by the clerk to the committee in July, 1898, in which he states that the mineral rights were merely nominal in value, and as far as I can ascertain the committee did not make any offer at all. Any offer that was made was made in the course of negotiations. Possibly the Commissioners said, "We will accept £500," and the committee might have then said, "We will give £400." The right hon. Gentleman is not quite entitled to make use of that as if it were an assessment of value by the North Wales Asylum Committee. Of course, they may have said, "If you insist on it we will offer £400," but not because they valued the mineral rights at £400. Quite the reverse; they valued them at nothing at all. All we can do is to protest against the manner in which the Woods and Forests Commissioners have thought fit to administer public property. With reference to re-afforestation, it is perfectly true, as the right hon. Gentleman said, that common rights are one of the greatest difficulties that the Commissioners have to encounter in trying to carry out this idea of re-afforestation, and I am very much afraid nothing can be done to remove it without legislation. I cannot discuss that question now, but there ought to be no difficulty in carrying through a short Act of Parliament to deal with this particular subject. It is a matter of considerable importance. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that this land could very often be put to better use.

MR. HANBURY: I said a little of it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: This land is absolutely worthless for tilling purposes, but it is admirable for re-afforestation. I cannot help thinking that if the Commissioners were to make experiments in this direction they would confer great benefits, not merely on Wales, but on the whole country. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that there was some difficulty in acquiring land for experiment. Surely that is not the case. Any number of these sheep walks are in the market year after year, and in such cases not merely the land, but the common rights could be acquired. If the Commissioners of Woods and Forests were really determined to make experiments there would be no difficulty in getting land. They have large revenues, and it is a great pity that they do not undertake experiments of this character. They are the only Government Department that can make these experiments, and I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will press them to be a little more bold in these experiments. I know they have tried something on one farm in Merionethshire, but it is on such a small scale that it is really not worth taking it into account. I think the country would back them up in making experiments on a larger scale.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: The right hon. Gentleman has stated that the North Wales Lunatic Asylums Committee offered a sum of £400 to the Woods and Forests Department. I must say I have never heard of any such offer. It may have been made in the course of negotiations, and under considerable pressure. I would refer the right hon. Gentleman to the correspondence. On the 7th July, 1898, the clerk to the committee, referring to the interview which the chairman of the committee and I had with the Commissioners of Woods and Forests on the 4th of July, laid before the Commissioners some of the grounds on which the committee believed that the minerals in the area proposed to be conveyed were merely of nominal value. Certainly at the time no offer of £400 had been made.

MR. HANBURY: The statement which has been placed in my hands is, I am bound to say, by no means explicit on the matter, but I will get the information for the hon. Member. I understood that it was a perfectly voluntary offer on the part of the committee.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I think it is impossible that that could be, because in the letter to which I have referred the committee set forth in detail their objections to paying anything but a nominal sum for the mineral rights, which they contended were practically valueless. The right hon. Gentleman has quoted from the report of the mineral agent, but I wish we had definite information from him or from someone else as to the value of these mineral rights. The right hon. Gentleman did not say a single word in contravention of the reasons urged why no charge should be made for them. The only minerals possible in that district are lead, flags, and stone, and any mineral expert can satisfy himself that there is no lead, no flags that would pay to work, no building stone and no road stone of any value. What we want is some evidence that these mineral rights are of any value at all. So far that evidence has not been forthcoming, and I shall have great pleasure in supporting, though for a different reason, the reduction which has been moved by my hon. friend to this Vote, although I should be glad, were it possible, to make a separate and independent protest in reference to this particular case. The correspondence shows that the Woods and Forests Department insisted in a most peremptory way on an immediate answer. The Asylums Committee were given a month to decide, and feeling that they were absolutely and entirely in the hands of the Woods and Forests Department they had no option but to comply with a request which they regarded as most unreasonable, and which was not supported by any evidence whatever. I have been given to understand outside the House that this charge was based on a precedent of a similar charge in some other part of Wales. It is, of course, quite possible that in that part of Wales the charge may have been perfectly justifiable, but in this particular district the committee of the lunatic asylum have been obliged to pay £444 for rights which are absolutely valueless. In fifty years that sum with compound interest will amount to about £2,000, and by that time it will be found that the mineral rights are as valueless as they are now. There are one or two questions I desire to ask the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the policy of the Woods and Forests Department in relation to leases of foreshore. The Report of the Committee issued in 1887 showed that these leases had been granted to individuals at comparatively small rents. For instance, 333 acres were let for £3 per acre. Of course I cannot blame the present Chief Commissioner for these rents, and I am not in any way reflecting on him. Then, again, 271 acres were leased at £1 per acre, and 161 acres at £5 per acre. The North Wales coast is becoming more valuable year by year. Watering places are springing up along the coast, and, in fact, one may look forward to the time when the coast will be a continuous row of houses. The foreshore will continue to become more and more valuable, and I would ask the right hon. Gentleman what is the policy of the Woods and Forests Department with regard to these leases of the foreshore. Do they invariably offer the leases by public auction, or do they treat with individuals privately? When they are dealing with public authorities do they exact the utmost farthing of what they can obtain by competition in the open market? When an individual offers to take a lease of a portion of the foreshore from the Commissioners is notice given to the nearest local authority in order that they may be able to make a bid for the land in the interest of the public? It is most important, as I need not remind the Committee, that foreshore land should be very carefully dealt with, and in the event of the local authority requiring any portion the Department should have no hesitation in dealing with them generously, having regard to the objects they have in view. On the other hand, if the Department are dealing with a private individual they should see that the utmost possible value is received for the land. Since the year 1881 up to a comparatively recent date the Woods and Forests Department have sold property in Wales to the value of £151,000. It is quite possible it would have been better if the Department had kept that property in hand. The value of the property they have purchased, not including the three farms to which the right hon. Gentleman has just referred, and which have been recently acquired, amounts only to £2,000, so that practically the Woods and Forests Department have received £150,000 more from Wales than they have invested in Wales. That being the case I venture to say we have a very strong claim indeed in insisting that the Department should reinvest this sum of £150,000 in the reafforestation of the Welsh hills. That is a fair and just demand, and I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to take it into consideration with the other matters to which I have alluded. With regard to the three farms which the right hon. Gentleman said had been acquired by the Department, I would ask him whether they have been acquired for the purpose of planting?

MR. HANBURY: Yes, Sir.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: What is their acreage?

MR. HANBURY: I cannot tell that.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: Then I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to tell us when the Vote is next under consideration. I would specially direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the important question I have ventured to raise with reference to the granting of foreshore leases to individuals, and that no leases should be granted without the consent of the local authorities. I thank the Committee for the patience and attention with which they have listened to my remarks, and I hope when the Vote is again under consideration the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give us a more satisfactory statement with reference to the case of the North Wales Lunatic Asylum Committee. It is too bad that a public institution should be charged such a large sum for mineral rights which are practically worthless. There is a very strong feeling in North Wales on this subject, and the Welsh Members deeply regret the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman has assumed towards it.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I desire to call attention to the sale of salmon fishing rights in Scotland. In one case the rights were sold for £50, which, as everyone knows, must have been a very poor fishery indeed. It was hardly worth the while of the Government——

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

POST OFFICE SITES [EXPENSES].

Resolution reported—

"That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all sums payable by the Postmaster General under any Act of the present session to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire Lands for the Public Service, and of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect the Provisions of such Act."

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [19TH JUNE].

Resolutions reported:—

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £10,000,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Transport and Remounts, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £13,100,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

Resolutions agreed to.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,680,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Clothing Establishments and Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

*MR. CHANNING: On this resolution I regret I shall have to offer some observations, because unfortunately I was unaware that the Votes would have been run through so quickly on Tuesday. Therefore I must apologise to the House for now offering some observations on behalf of the district I represent on this resolution. We are all aware, from letters which have reached this country from the front, of the complaints—I hope the exaggerated complaints—with reference to the failure of the boots supplied to the troops. I certainly hope that some of these letters were of a picturesque character, and did not really represent the average conditions. I wish, however as representing a district very largely concerned in this question, to draw attention to the reply given by the hon.

Member opposite to my hon. friend the Member for Leicester, who also represents a district which is interested in this question, in which the hon. Member stated that the boots supplied by the regular Army contractors had shown no more than the usual average of defects which caused the rejection of a small proportion. But, Sir, it is perfectly notorious that in the case of the boots supplied to the Yeomanry and the Volunteers it was found necessary, apparently, to go outside the regular Army contractors, and to obtain supplies from slop shops and middlemen which were of an exceedingly unsatisfactory kind. One of these firms—Messrs. Samuel—have been struck off the list of Army contractors. I think we and all interested in the Yeomanry and Volunteers have a right to insist that they should be looked after as well as the Regular troops, and that the War Office should take over in a systematic way the supply of boots to them. I desire especially to complain of the War Office for not having an adequate supply of boots, and for having been, therefore, compelled to have recourse to manufacturers in India, whose boots were not tested as the boots supplied by the regular British contractors are tested in the Pimlico department. The hon. Gentleman opposite has complained that the hand-sewn industry was dying away in this country, but after several conferences with both manufacturers and artisans in that industry, I must say that the Government, and especially the War Office, have been very short-sighted in their treatment of the hand-sewn industry. They cannot expect this industry to be kept up, in the face of the rise in price of materials and wages, without sufficient inducements both to the manufacturers and the workmen. A complaint was, I believe, made by Lord Roberts as to certain patterns and types of boots being too stiff and uncomfortable for the troops. I wish to point out that the real responsibility rests with the clothing department at Pimlico. It is known to the House that manufacturers are bound down by specifications and regulations which compel them to produce boots of a certain design, and these boots are never rejected by the clothing department because of the design, which in fact has been determined by themselves. I think it is high time that there should be a departmental inquiry into these matters, and that greater elasticity in designs and more inventiveness should be encouraged in order that boots of different types might be obtained which would be suited to the various climates and conditions in which our Army is compelled to carry out its operations. I complain, on behalf of the trade in my own constituency, of the unreadiness of the War Office, and their action in rushing to India in order to provide boots for two army corps. At the time this order was sent to India rather less contracts than usual had been given in Northamptonshire, and it was only in January that orders were sent down, when it became necessary to make further provision, and after there had been considerable complaint as to going to India for a supply of boots. I am assured by experts that the action of the War Office in obtaining these boots from India was exceedingly injudicious, because Indian boots had failed to a very large extent in the Soudan campaign. The boots which really stood the hard wear of the campaign in the Soudan were supplied by Northampton manufacturers, and were specially made with wiring and screws. I am assured that the leather used for the Indian boots is very thin and is inferior in tanning to the leather used in this country. The Indian leather might be used for uppers in this country, but no one would ever dream of using it for the soles of boots intended for hard wear. It seems to me that the failure of the boots described in many of the soldiers' letters from the front may be due to the fact that they were taken from the Indian stores instead of being strong, well-fitted boots, suitable for rough wear in a difficult country like South Africa. It was stated by the War Office, when the first protest was made against the use of boots from India, that that was done because it was not possible to meet all the requirements in the time from the resources of the home trade, and that no question of money influenced the transaction. I do not think that that explanation can be accepted as quite satisfactory. I am assured that all the boots required could easily have been supplied by British manufacturers. I have already pointed out that a smaller number of contracts than usual was given out in the autumn, although war was imminent, and it was not until later that larger contracts were issued. Some complaint was made that the manufacturers had asked too large a price, but the price of leather had risen upwards of 20 per cent. and labour had also risen, and the manufacturers were accordingly entitled to a reasonable increase in price. It was admitted by the hon. Member the Financial Secretary to the War Office that the Indian boots were bought at about the lowest price paid for English boots, and accordingly a considerable saving was effected by the transaction. I would not complain of that if the boots were equal to English boots, but when we are assured by experts that these boots were much inferior and were not suitable for active service in a rough country, I think the responsibility was very considerable and the policy of saving very unsatisfactory. I should like to ask how it was that this country was not provided with a sufficient supply of boots for this campaign, and that India had such a large stock ready. That seems very extraordinary. [Several HON. MEMBERS: Divide, divide!] If hon. Members are impatient they should remember I represent one of the districts chiefly interested in this industry. I would ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office how far the statement in the *Shoe and Leather Record*, to the effect that there was no question that all the boots required could have been supplied by the county of Northampton, and that twopence per pair was the actual amount which divided the parties, represents the facts. These Indian boots were not subjected to any of the tests applied to English boots, and I think it is only reasonable to insist that when the War Office is compelled to have recourse to outside sources similar tests should be imposed. The Government ought to have had a sufficient supply available, and failing that, they ought at least to have made sure that the boots obtained to make up the deficiency should be submitted to the same tests as English boots. In conclusion, it seems to me to be plainly the duty of the War Office to conduct an inquiry into the best type of boot for our troops, and that they should also institute some intelligible and workable system of securing an adequate and satisfactory supply of boots for all branches—the Yeomanry and Volunteers as well as the Regular troops—in order that the scandals we have heard of in the present campaign should be impossible in the future, and that contractors who engage in this work should be given fair treatment.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): We have now had the advantage of hearing the speech which the hon. Gentleman was unavoidably prevented from delivering on Tuesday last, and I feel I can best consult the wishes of hon. Members by making a very brief reply. The hon. Member expressed his concern as to reports regarding the failure of the boots supplied to the troops, but in a report received from Sir Redvers Buller on 13th March he stated that, on the whole, he considered that the clothing and equipment of the men had worn well, and that that was especially the case as regards the boots, which had been subjected to an exceptionally hard test, owing to constant wear and the stony nature of the country in which the operations took place. The hon. Member next expressed his regret that we had not an adequate supply of boots at the beginning of the war. We have sent to South Africa over 200,000 men, and in addition to the boots the men took with them, we have sent out 374,000 pairs of boots. I have listened to many debates in this House, but I have never heard it suggested that we should keep 500,000 pairs of boots as a precaution against the possibility of warlike operations. In buying Army boots there were three things to be considered—excellence of material, expedition in delivery, and cost. The cost comes last, and promptness in delivery comes first, and I will not apologise for one moment because we did order 60,000 pairs of boots from India. It is not true that those boots were not inspected. They were taken from stores in India and were all inspected before being stored. They were the boots worn during the mountainous campaign in the Tirah, and so far from being condemned during the operations on the Nile, they were specially praised by Lord Kitchener after the campaign. Since we ordered these boots from India we have ordered 550,000 pairs in England. I think the House will feel I have already trespassed two long on its time in discussing this matter.

Resolution agreed to.

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,000,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Supply and Repair of Warlike and other Stores, which will come in course of payment

during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,670,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Staff for Engineer Services, and Expenditure for Royal Engineer Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad (including Purchases), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901.

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £113,800, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Establishments for Military Education, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £66,900, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Sundry Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,611,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers and others, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,379,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals and the In-Pensioners thereof, of Out-Pensions, of the Maintenance of Lunatics for whom Pensions are not drawn, and of Gratuities awarded in Commutation and in lieu of Pensions, of Rewards for Meritorious Services, of Victoria Cross Pensions, and of Pensions to the Widows and Children of Warrant Officers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £186,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900—1901.

CLASS VI.

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £284,058, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities under sundry Statutes for Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities awarded by the Treasury, and for the Salaries of Medical Referees."

12. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,800, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for certain Pensions to Masters and Seamen of the Merchant Service, and to their Widows and Children."

13. "That a sum, not exceeding £725, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for certain Miscellaneous, Charitable, and other Allowances."

CLASS VII.

14. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,452, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and other Expenses of Temporary Commissions, Committees, and Special Inquiries."

15. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,370, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for certain Miscellaneous Expenses."

16. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for a Grant in Aid of the Expenses of the Royal Commission for the British Section at the Paris International Exhibition, 1900."

Resolutions agreed to.

Adjourned at half after Twelve of the clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 25*th June*, 1900.

LORD INCHIQUIN.

Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Lucius William, Baron of Inchiquin, to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

ROYAL ASSENT.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

1. Public Health (Ireland).
2. Uganda Railway.
3. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1).
4. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3).
5. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4).
6. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5).
7. Rhymney Iron Company.
8. Church's Patent.
9. Otley Urban District Council Water.
10. Cork, Bandon, and South Coast Railway.
11. Higham Ferrers Water.
12. Cleethorpes Gas.
13. Dundee Harbour.
14. London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway.
15. Governments Stock and other Securities Investment Company.
16. Southport Water.
17. Hastings Harbour.
18. Maidenhead Gas.
19. Glastonbury Corporation Gas.
20. Manchester Ship Canal.
21. Central London Railway.
22. Lancashire Inebriates Acts Board.
23. Dorking Water.
24. Fishguard Water and Gas.
25. Menstone Water (Transfer).
26. Newport Corporation.
27. Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas.
28. Cowes Pier.
29. Great Central Railway.

NEW PEER.

The Right Hon. Sir Peter O'Brien, Baronet, Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, having been created Baron O'Brien of Kilfenora in the county of Clare—was (in the usual manner) introduced.

SAT FIRST.

The Earl of Londesborough sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

- Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways.
- Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways.
- British Gas Light Company (Staffordshire Potteries).
- Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water.
- Lancaster Corporation.
- St. David's Railway Abandonment.
- West Bromwich Corporation.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

- Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas).
- Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

GREAT BERKHAMPSTEAD WATER BILL [H.L.].

MOTHERWELL WATER BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

AIRDRIE, COATBRIDGE, AND DISTRICT WATER TRUST BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 30th of

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

April and 28th of May last discharged; and Bill committed for To-morrow.

WOLVERHAMPTON GAS BILL.

CALEDONIAN RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

WOODBRIDGE DISTRICT WATER BILL.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY BILL.

LONDON AND SAN FRANCISCO BANK BILL [H.L.].

HAMMOND (G. H.) COMPANY BILL [H.L.].

CRYSTAL PALACE COMPANY BILL [H.L.].

Reported with Amendments.

LATIMER ROAD AND ACTON RAILWAY BILL.

Reported with an Amendment.

HAMILTON, MOTHERWELL, AND WISHAW TRAMWAYS BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

AIRDRIE AND COATBRIDGE TRAMWAYS BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

ST. ALBANS WATER BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (WALES) BILL.

DEVONPORT CORPORATION BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

MORECAMBE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (GAS) BILL.

Read 3^a, and passed.

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [H.L.].

WITHINGTON URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

BIRMINGHAM (KING EDWARD THE SIXTH) SCHOOLS BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

LEE CONSERVANCY BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Rosse be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Ribblesdale, and that the Earl of Rosse be Chairman of the said Committee; read and agreed to.

READING CORPORATION (TRAMWAYS) BILL.

WELLINGBOROUGH AND DISTRICT TRAMROADS BILL.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (SPITALFIELDS MARKET) BILL.

WOLVERHAMPTON, ESSINGTON, AND CANNOCK CHASE JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL.

NORTH METROPOLITAN RAILWAY AND CANAL BILL.

MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Dartrey be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Carysfort (*E. Carysfort*); read, and agreed to.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL [H.L.].

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made: Standing

Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 1) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a to-morrow.

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (PETERSHAM) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed.

GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL. (No. 123.)

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL. (No. 124.)

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; referred to the Examiners; and to be read 2^a To-morrow.—(*The Lord Balfour.*)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL. (No. 125.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL. (No. 126.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) BILL. (No. 127.)

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; referred to the Examiners; and to be read 2^a To-morrow.—(*The Lord Harris.*)

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CERTIFIED INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES (REGULATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT).

Regulations made with the approval of the Home Secretary for the management and discipline of the Farmfield Certified Inebriate Reformatory, Charlwood, near Horley: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

COLONIAL STOCK BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Colonial Stock Acts, 1877 and 1892, and the Trustee Act, 1893—was presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 122.)

MILITIA BALLOT BILL [H.L.].

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I had hoped to-day to move the Second Reading of what really is the Government's Militia Ballot Bill, which stands in my name; but this morning I was asked, on behalf of Members of your Lordships' House who take great interest in this and similar questions, to put it off, and I have agreed to postpone it for a week. I hope this adjournment will not be inconvenient to your Lordships, but I do not think I can do other than postpone it under the circumstances. But I can give your Lordships this assurance, that if I am alive on this day week I shall move the Second Reading of the Bill, because I fully recognise the importance of the question, and, if the noble Marquess will allow me to say so, the fatuous futility of his emergency measures.

Second Reading, by leave of the House, put off to Monday next.

POOR REMOVAL BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD HARRIS: My Lords, this Bill, which has passed through the House of Commons, has for its object the removal of a grievance which has been long felt in Ireland. In Ireland there is no law of settlement in force, and persons born in England or Scotland who are resident in Ireland, and find it necessary to apply for relief, cannot under any circumstances be removed to Great Britain. On the other hand, persons born in Ireland to whom relief has been given in England or Scotland might, under certain conditions, be removed to Ireland, notwithstanding that they had been for a long while resident in Great Britain. The existing law has for many years given rise to complaints by the Irish Members and others. In the case of Scotland, the grievance has been removed by the Poor Law (Scotland) Act, 1898. Under the existing law in England a person born in Ireland who resides continuously for a term of three years in any parish without receiving relief acquires a settlement in that parish, and if a person who applies for relief has resided in a poor-law union continuously for one year immediately preceding his application without having received relief, he cannot be removed if he applies for relief in that union. If, however, he applies for relief in a union in which he has not resided continuously for such twelve months, he may be removed to the union in which he is settled, and in default of a settlement may be transhipped to Ireland. The only cases in which there would seem to be hardship under the present law are those in which a person born in Ireland has passed a number of years in England without acquiring a settlement, and has not resided continuously for a year in the union in which he is resident when he requires relief. This hardship will be removed by the provision in Clause 1 (1) of the Bill, which will enact that a person who has resided continuously for five years in England shall not be removable to Ireland. The result of this will, of course, be that if he requiries relief in England he will have to be relieved in the union in which he is residing unless he has acquired a settlement in some other union. The law in force in England will be assimilated by the clause to that of Scotland under the Poor Law (Scotland) Act, 1898. Clause 1 (2) of the Bill will empower a board of guardians in England, instead of removing a pauper to Ireland, to agree with the board of guardians in Ireland to whom he would be chargeable for the maintenance of the pauper at the expense of the last-mentioned board of guardians. This provision is intended to meet cases in which the removal of the pauper would be inadvisable on the ground of old age or sickness, or some other sufficient reason.

Bill read 2^a (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

UNION OF BENEFICES ACT, 1860, AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, the object of this Bill is to extend the operation of the Union of Benefices Act, 1860, outside London. The evils which that Act was intended to remedy are not confined to the metropolitan area, but are to be found in a great many other parts of England. I myself tried repeatedly to get the same thing done in the city of Exeter, when I was bishop there, as is done by this Act for metropolitan parishes. There are twenty-one parishes in the city of Exeter, several of them very small. The incomes are also very small, and it would certainly be a great gain for the working of those parishes if several could be united and the incomes amalgamated. The same thing applies to the city of Norwich, where there are thirty benefices or more. All of them are very small, with very small incomes, and the application of this Act to such a city would, I have no doubt, be of great benefit to the working of the church in that city. I remember Bishop Pelham of Norwich once telling me that he wished very much indeed that this Act could be extended so as to include places like his own city. There are a great number of similar cases scattered about England, and the need for dealing with them having become stronger and stronger, a Bill has accordingly been drafted to extend the operation of the Act of 1860 to the whole of England and Wales, subject, of course, to the same limitations as are to be found in the principal Act. The Bill simply extends the principal Act, and its clauses consist solely of modifications of that Act so as to adapt it to the needs of other places than the metropolis. For instance, in the first sub-section it is provided that the references in the principal Act to the Bishop of the Diocese of London or of Winchester, which covered the metropolitan area at that time, shall be construed as references to the bishop of the Diocese in which the benefices are situate, which are to be united outside the metropolis. In the working out of the principal Act, certain Commissioners were appointed, one by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, two by the Bishop, and two by the Corporation, or, in the event of the Corporation not acting, by the vestries of the parishes concerned. The Bill proposes that instead of these Commissioners—it is clear that they would not be suitable all over England—there should be a Commission of seven, two to be appointed by the Bishop, one by the patron of each of the benefices, one by the vestry of each of the parishes to be united, and a magistrate nominated by the person who has presided as chairman of the last preceding Quarter Sessions for the county or division of the county, or if there be no such person then by the Lord Lieutenant of the county. This Commission is of the same character as the Commission in the principal Act, and I have no doubt your Lordships will see that it consists of persons to whom such work can be properly entrusted. Where the Bishop causes proposals for a scheme of union to be prepared, it is here enacted that he should send them in the first instance to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. As there will be on the Commission representatives of the vestries, it is not proposed to send the proposals to those bodies, but to forward them straight to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for them to prepare a scheme. That is the principal adaptation. There are also two or three minor adaptations. At the end of Section 11 of the principal Act it is provided that the calculation of the income, where there is any surplus, is to be based on the income for the seven years immediately following the Act itself. It is now proposed that the seven years should be fixed by a date in the scheme formed as I have described. In other respects, the provisions of the Bill are simply adaptation which it is not necessary to go into in detail. There is one sub-section, however, which lies a little outside the purview of the others—Sub-section 8. A power is given in that sub-section to take down a consecrated chapel of ease which it is found is no longer of any use. Of course, when you have a chapel of ease which is no longer needed it is better to remove it, because otherwise there is a duty imposed on the clergyman of the parish which is onerous to him and of no advantage, as the case stands, to anybody else. This is a very simple measure, as your Lordships can see. It is nothing more than an adaptation of an old Act, but I can assure your Lordships that something of the sort is very necessary.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, it is not very easy to understand exactly what the effect of this Bill will be, and I should be very glad if the most rev. Prelate could tell us whether it makes any alteration in the essential provisions of the present law. It is only where parishes adjoin, and the churches are within a certain distance of each other, that a union can take place at present, and I should like to know whether that limitation will be interfered with by this Bill if it becomes law, and whether it will be in the power of anyone other than the bishop to initiate proposals. In some cases it would be a hardship, and a very serious one, to unite two livings without the consent of the patron; and it may be sometimes extremely objectionable that there should be taken away from a patron the right to appoint to a particular parish. I am sorry to say that the divisions in the Church at present are of so serious a nature that it may easily happen that a parish where the patron hitherto has been able to secure those who are faithful to the principles of the Church of England may be united with a larger parish, with the result that the state of affairs in the parish where hitherto the patron has been able to prevent the appointment of clergymen who are distasteful to the inhabitants may be altogether changed.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I can assure the noble Earl that the Bill makes no change in the law with regard to patronage as settled by the Act of 1860, nor with regard to the limitations that only parishes that are contiguous can be united. I do not think there is any reason to fear that the rights of patrons will not be safeguarded under this Bill just as they are now under the Act of 1860.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I thank the most rev. Prelate for his explanation, but I wish to say, in order that I may not be misunderstood, that I am strongly in favour of the general principle of uniting these small livings.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment, and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1:—

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: I understand that the original Act, the Military Manœuvres Act of 1897, may be modified under this Bill so that areas may be used for consecutive years without the limitation of five years. I should like to know if that is so.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, this change in the main Act was made on the recommendation of the Manœuvres Commission, which was appointed under the Act of 1897. The point which they had to deal with was this: Under the main Act the same land may not be scheduled more than once in five years, but, having once been scheduled, it cannot be scheduled again, whether it is used or not. What this Bill does is to enable us, when land has been scheduled and not used, to schedule it again within the same period of five years, but only once.

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:—

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: I observe that it is mentioned in the first section of Clause 4 that the Secretary of State may use the areas which are "delineated and coloured red on the maps signed for the purposes of this Act by the Speaker of the House of Commons and deposited at the War Office." What I want to ask is, will these maps be sent down to the local authorities concerned previous to being sanctioned by Parliament? As regards the district in which I live—namely, the New Forest—there is considerable anxiety on this subject, and the local authorities would, no doubt, be glad to know what the area selected was, in order that they might, if they thought desirable, raise objection to it before it was actually sanctioned by Parliament.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I think the suggestion of my noble friend is a very reasonable one. In the case of the area in which he is particularly interested I have already given instructions that an officer is to be deputed to visit the locality, and, if necessary, confer with the occupiers or owners of the land in the neighbourhood. I have no doubt that my noble friend has noticed that there is another sub-section in the same clause, under which it is laid down that before any of these lands can be used in the manner proposed notice has to be given by advertisement in the newspapers. I can assure my noble friend that every possible exertion will be made to avoid any inconvenience to those who reside in the neighbourhood of the land over which these military manœuvres are to take place.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: Will the local authorities be given an opportunity of expressing an opinion before the areas are sanctioned by Parliament, or afterwards?

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I do not think it will be possible to alter the areas after the Bill has been passed through Parliament, but while the Bill is passing through Parliament there will be every opportunity given to those who desire to criticise the areas which have been included.

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

COUNTY SURVEYORS (IRELAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

NAVAL RESERVE (MOBILISATION) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

EARL SPENCER: I asked the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Hopetoun) some questions the other day with regard to this Bill. I thought at the time that there did not appear to be much necessity for the Bill, but since then I have had an opportunity of consulting various persons, and I find that the fourteenth clause of the previous Act does not apply in the manner described by me, but merely gives the Admiralty power to relieve men altogether from the Reserve. Therefore I quite concur in the importance of making easier the terms under which Reservists are called out, and I am perfectly satisfied as to the necessity for this Bill.

Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Five of the clock, till To-morrow, half-past ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 25th June, 1900.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went, and being returned,

MR. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills (see page 873).

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD BILL [Lords] (BY ORDER).

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I rise to move that this Bill be read a third time this day three months. In doing so I wish to disclaim any hostility either to the Bill or to the promoters. But I wish to bring before the promoters a question of very considerable importance — namely, the necessity for the establishment of a ferry between Bootle, on the Lancashire side of the Mersey, and New Brighton, on the Cheshire side. Let me first, however, express my gratitude to the promoters of the Bill for their courtesy in putting it back until this day to meet my personal convenience. At the same time may I say that, if I am forced to take this motion to a division, it will be the fault of the promoters, as I shall be satisfied if only they will give me a small crumb of comfort by promising to encourage the construction of this ferry. This Mersey Docks and Harbour Board is, no doubt, an important representative body, but I am afraid I must endorse the criticism published in a critical journal in Liverpool—the *Porcupine*—which charges it with traditional obstinacy. I am in a position to show that it has displayed obstinacy in this particular matter, for it has had it before it for no less a period than twenty years, and has continually thrust it on one side. Now that it is seeking borrowing powers I propose, with the permission of the House, to show how it may usefully apply some of the money it proposes to raise. Bootle has a corporation; it has a representative in this House; it has a population of 54,000.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I do not quite see what the question of a ferry between Bootle and New Brighton has to do with the Bill.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: The Mersey Docks and Harbour Board seek borrowing powers in the Bill, and I desire to point out that in the interest of Bootle some of the money should be used in establishing this ferry.

*MR. SPEAKER: Yes; but they are not borrowing money for the purpose of making a ferry.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: No, for general purposes.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think it is open to the hon. Member to discuss the question whether or not they should establish a ferry between Bootle and New Brighton.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Under the powers they already possess the Board have power to borrow money for the improvement of their undertaking, and as they are now asking power to borrow I wish to point out how the money can best be applied. Perhaps you will allow me to make my statement.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member, but I must point out that, unless he can show that the ferry question is in some way raised by the Bill, it is not open to discussion. From what he has said I do not gather that it is.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: They seek to borrow money for the purposes of the Dock Estate, and that surely would include the establishment of a ferry.

*MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member say that any section in existing Acts empowers the Board to establish a ferry?

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I take it that they have power to establish a ferry if they so desire, or to carry out any other improvement.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I rise to a point of order. The Board has no powers and no kind of authority to establish a ferry between Bootle and New Brighton.

*MR. SPEAKER: Then the hon. Member will not be in order in discussing the question.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I may say that the public body on the other side of the river are willing to put the ferry there if they can only get the permission of the Dock Board.

*MR. SPEAKER: The matter cannot be discussed upon this Bill.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I daresay I shall find an opportunity of raising it on a future occasion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—

Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords].
Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [Lords].
Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [Lords].
Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [Lords].
Preston Corporation Bill [Lords].
Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have not been complied with, viz.:—

Salford Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill.
London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

OSSETT CORPORATION GAS BILL.

SOUTHPORT EXTENSION AND TRAMWAYS BILL.

STOCKPORT CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

PAIGNTON URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL [Lords].

Prince of Wales's consent, as Duke of Cornwall, signified. Verbal Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY BILL.

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

BARNSLEY CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

FISHGUARD AND ROSSLARE RAILWAYS AND HARBOURS BILL [Lords].

GLYNCORRWG URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL GAS BILL [Lords].

MERSEY RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

MOTHERWELL AND BELLSHILL RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY (STEAM VESSELS) BILL [Lords].

ROTHERHAM CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

WESTGATE AND BIRCHINGTON WATER BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

LONDON (CLERKENWELL AND HOLBORN) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LONDON (POPLAR) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

Reported, without amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

Reported, without amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11) BILL.

Reported, without amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

SHEFFIELD DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVONPORT TRAMWAYS BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

BIRMINGHAM CORPORATION (STOCK) BILL [Lords].

Reported, without amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time.

EDINBURGH DISTRICT LUNACY BOARD BILL [Lords].

LINCOLN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

NEATH HARBOUR BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Amendments to Cowes Pier Bill [Lords], Great Central Railway Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to enable the South Eastern Railway Company to make new Railways and other works; to acquire additional lands; to provide for the application of capital of the South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Companies; and for other purposes." South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to empower the Urban District Council for the district of Withington to construct Tramways and to make various street improvements; and for other purposes." Withington Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [Lords].

WITHINGTON URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

FALKIRK AND DISTRICT WATER BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Gourock; and Dumbarton; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS).

Petition from Buckland Brewer, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Edinburgh; and Kirriemuir; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Kingston-on-Thames; and Ticehurst; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petition from Rothesay, against establishment; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Hammersmith; Willington Quay; Benwell-on-Tyne; Wallsend; Walbottle; Throckley; Wells; Bardon Mill; Five Oak Green; Prudhoe-on-Tyne; Over; and Haltwhistle; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against, from North Shields; South Shields; Windsor; and Exmouth; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Chester; Damerham; Fordingbridge; Wotton-under-Edge (two); Bishopston; Wigton; Glossop (three); Newfield; Shrewsbury (three); Cottenham; Chatham; North Skelton; Brotton; Saltburn; Wisbech; Ashcott; Wisbech St. Peters; Nunney; Wanstrow; Glastonbury; Kendal (five); Newcastle; Windermere; Leeds; Aylesford; Greasborough; Glasgow; Horsley Heath; Liverpool (two); Wigan (three); Sutton Coldfield; Olton; Leek; Cam; Wandsworth (three); Balham; Beccles; Bungay; Wallasey; West Derby; Wallsend; Barnard Castle; Penygelli; Thurning; Walker; Birmingham (two); Harborne (two); Walbottle; Dore (two); West Bridgford; Longtown; Gateshead-on-Tyne; Willington Quay; Ladywood; Guildford; Copley Lane; North Shields; Tynemouth; South Shields (two); Northwich; Leigh; Dalwood; Micklethwaite; Luxborough; Pedwell; Newcastle-Emlyn; Bingley; Bolton; Stockwell; Kennington; Milton; Faversham; Sittingbourne; Ince; Tonbridge; Harp Castle; Durley; Ebbw Vale (two); Oldham; Lowgate; Brynteg; Warden; Luton; Rishton; Morton; Prudhoe; Hexham; Haydon Bridge; Newborough; Bardon Mill (two); Tunstall; Corbridge-on-Tyne; Hadlow; Middle Madeley; Bellingham; Wigan; Tunbridge Wells; Haltwhistle (two); Basingstoke; Shrewley; Victoria; Llangattock; Hadfield; Cambridge (three); Talgarth; Plumstead; Purton; Woolwich; Northwich; Bradford; Ardwick; Old Chesterton; Long Eaton; Axminster (two); Bingley (three); Chatteris; Woodhouse; Folkestone (two); Wharfedale; Gilsted; Otterburn; Nantyglo; Aberystwith; Bideford; Seaton; Middlewich; Exmouth (two); Lympstone; Colyton; Honiton; Sidmouth; Bently; and Hull; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Irongray; Glasgow; and Gulston; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Troon; Brierley Hill; Horseley Heath; Dore; Islington; Newfield; Shrewsbury (two); Cottenham; Sunderland; Cam; Brotton; Wisbech; Wanstrow; Nunney; Glossop (six); Hayle; Windermere; Kentish Town; Tuckingmill; Camborne; Cambria; Wigan (three); Blackburn; Bramley; Sheldon; Tamworth; Sutton Coldfield; Olton; Etley; Wootton-under-Edge (two); Liverpool (three); Weston-super-Mare; Bungay; Beccles; Wallasey; North Shields; Copley Lane; Barnard Castle; Newcastle; South Shields; Godalming; Fenton; Willington Quay; Leigh; Walker; Harborne (two); Throckley; Birmingham (two); Newborough; Prudhoe-on-Tyne; Abertillery; Warden; Rishton; Oldham; Lowgate; Corbridge-on-Tyne; Bellingham; Wharfedale; Glasgow; Victoria; Long Compton; Northwich; Cambridge; Talgarth; Llangattock; Beaufort; Bradford; Plumstead; Woolwich; Mansfield; Mansfield Woodham; Manchester; Chatteris; Weston-super-Mare (four); Bardon Mill (two); Blaina; Appledore; Bideford; East Kirkby; Middlewich; Leytonstone; Beer; Colyton; Sidmouth; York; Kingsteignton; Over; Haltwhistle; Purton; Axminster; Budleigh Salterton; Seaton; Luxborough; Newcastle Emlyn; Isle of Sheppey; Sittingbourne; Ince; and Hays Castle; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Llangattock; Glyncorwg; and Talgarth; to lie upon the Table.

TEMPERANCE REFORM THREEFOLD OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Elder Park, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VAGRANTS' CHILDREN PROTECTION BILL.

Petition from Oldham, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA RAILWAYS (PURCHASE).

Return [presented 22nd June] to be printed. [No. 232.]

INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES (RULES FOR MANAGEMENT).

Copy Presented, of Regulations for the Management of the Farmfield Certified Inebriate Reformatory, Charlwood, near Horley [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report No. 290 (British Guiana, Annual Reports for 1897–8 and 1898–9) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report No. 291 (Falkland Islands, Annual Report for 1899) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CYPRUS.

Copy presented, of Annual Reports for 1898–9 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS).

Copy presented, of Report No. 13 (Cook Islands, Report for 1899) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.

Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of St. Andrews for the year 1898–9 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 233.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2461 and 2462 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 528 and 529 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (CONTRACTS).

Return ordered, "of all Contracts made in the United Kingdom for manufactured articles by the several Government Departments between the 1st day of April, 1899, and the 31st day of March, 1900, either with contractors outside the United Kingdom or with contractors or agents who obtain the articles from Abroad (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 364, of Session 1899)."—(*Sir Howard Vincent.*)

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Special Report by the Board of Trade on the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Return ordered, "of Net Public Income and Net Public Expenditure under certain specified Heads, as represented by Receipts into and Issues out of the Exchequer from 1869–70 to 1899–1900, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 309, of Session 1899."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*)

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "giving the number of Arrests for Drunkenness within the Metropolitan Police District of Dublin and the cities of Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, on Sundays between the 1st day of May 1899 and the 30th day of April, 1900, both days inclusive; the Arrests being given from 8 a.m. on Sundays till 8 a.m. on Mondays; and similar Returns for the rest of Ireland from the 1st day of May 1899 to the 30th day of April, 1900 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 131, of Session 1900)."—(*Mr. William Johnston.*)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — BOER PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA.

Mr. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will explain why tobacco is sold free of duty to prisoners of war in the Island of St. Helena, and a duty charged upon the tobacco sold to the British troops in the island; and why the Boer force receives preferential treatment as compared with the British force. I may further ask if it is a fact that the Boer prisoners are fed on fresh meat while the British troops have to eat tinned meats?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I know nothing whatever about the last statement. Presents for the Boer prisoners have been exempted from duty, but no instructions have been given for selling tobacco to them free of duty, which, however, is only one-fifth of the duty on tobacco imported into the United Kingdom. The exemption from duty accorded to presents for the Boer prisoners at St. Helena had been previously granted in the case of Boer prisoners at Cape Town, and had also been granted by the Transvaal authorities in the case of presents for the British prisoners at Pretoria. I think that the British troops at St. Helena should also receive this privilege in the case of presents sent to them, and I am instructing the Governor to this effect.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): Are the presents for the Boer prisoners sent from the United Kingdom or from Cape Colony?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot answer that with any positiveness, but I believe they are sent from Cape Colony.

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN CAPETOWN AND ST. HELENA.

MR. BILL (Staffordshire, Leek): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that complaints have been made of the delay in forwarding letters and parcels from Cape Town, addressed from England, to the troops now in St. Helena; and whether he will take steps to ensure a punctual delivery of the mails in that island.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): No such complaints have come to the Postmaster General's notice. Letters and parcels from England for St. Helena do not in the ordinary course pass through Cape Town, but are sent direct, and if any delay of the kind has occurred it must be in the case of letters and parcels re-directed from the Cape Colony. No efforts will be wanting on the Postmaster General's part to ensure the punctual delivery of the mails for St. Helena. At the present time, in addition to the regular monthly mail provided by contract, mails are despatched by any other advantageous opportunity that offers; but these extra mails are conveyed by vessels over which the Postmaster General cannot exercise any control.

COST OF HORSE TRANSPORT TO THE CAPE.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Oldham): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he can give the average cost per horse in freight for the carriage of horses from England to South Africa since the beginning of October, 1899, up to the end of May, 1900.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.): In the few cases in which it has been possible to arrange for the conveyance of horses from this country to the Cape on freight, the cost has averaged £25 10s. per horse landed. Owing to the difference in the ships as to rate of hire, speed, consumption of coal, cost of fitting, the number of horses and men respectively which they carry, and the number of voyages which they make, it is impossible, without elaborate and lengthy calculations, to say what has been the average cost of conveying horses by transport, but it is believed it will closely approximate the ordinary charge of the Union Castle line for the passage of a horse to Cape Town—£35.

MARTIAL LAW — THE ALLEGED FENIAN PRISONERS AT MAFEKING.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he can now say if the station-master, Mr. Quinlan, and the other alleged Fenians, whom Colonel Baden-Powell was reported some months ago to have in custody in Mafeking, are still alive; and, if so, where they are, upon what charge were they arrested, were they tried, and, if so, by what tribunal, and upon what charge, and what was the sentence.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): No information on this subject has yet reached the War Office. Lord Roberts was instructed by telegraph on the 9th of March that a record of all proceedings taken under martial law in South Africa should be sent to the War Office. It is, therefore, unnecessary to send inquiries about particular cases, and in view of the amount of work at present falling on the staff in South Africa, such inquiries are clearly undesirable. I do not think that the hon. Member need be anxious. I read a newspaper report subsequent to the relief of Mafeking to the effect that Mr. Quinlan had been detained during three days mainly for his own protection.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: It is on a newspaper report that I base my question. I only hope the right hon. Gentleman is right.

LINDLEY DISASTERS (1ST JUNE)—THE 13TH YEOMANRY BATTALION.

MR. BUTCHER (York): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to give any details as to the disaster which befell the 13th Yeomanry Battalion; and whether, in view of the anxiety which prevails in Dublin, Belfast, and other places on this subject, he will take steps to ensure the speedy publication of the names of those who have been killed or wounded or are missing.

*MR. WYNDHAM: All the information on this subject which has reached the War Office has been published, including the casualty lists of killed and wounded. Since I came to the House I have received a note to the effect that a telegram has arrived from Lord Roberts stating that he knows no more than has already been telegraphed.

MR. BUTCHER: Is the hon. Gentleman in a position to say with reference to the casualty list whether it comprises the complete list, or only refers to the wounded found by Lord Methuen at Lindley?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I thought I had made it clear that we had published all the information we have as yet received. Nothing is to be gained by sending out particular inquiries, as they would only cause delay. The information is sent at the earliest possible moment, and published within fifteen minutes of its receipt at the War Office.

DUKE OF EDINBURGH'S VOLUNTEER RIFLES—MR. LOGAN'S GIFT OF A MAXIM GUN.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a message was sent by Mr. Logan, a member of the Cape Parliament, to Lieutenant-Colonel Spence Douglas, stating that he was exceedingly glad that the gun which he had given to the regiment had been of use, and that he would pay the men using it one pound for every rebel they shot, but would deduct 25 per cent. for all prisoners taken; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The Lieutenant-Colonel Spence Douglas referred to appears to be Lieutenant-Colonel Spence who was killed at Douglas, and to whose corps (the Duke of Edinburgh's Volunteer Rifles) Mr. Logan presented a Maxim gun. Nothing is known of the message, and the Secretary of State for War is not prepared to take any steps in the matter.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is it the case that Mr. Logan is a member of the Cape Parliament, and probably a follower of Mr. Rhodes?

[No answer was given.]

YEOMANRY ADJUTANTS' PAY.

MR. WINGFIELD-DIGBY (Dorsetshire, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state how much the Government expect Yeomanry adjutants to spend in doing their duties on pay which is only 10s. a day against 13s. with their own regiment; and if, seeing that a Yeomanry adjutant has to do the work of two adjutants and two quartermasters, and pay all travelling expenses for himself, horse, and servants on £4 a year for each squadron in the brigade, he will take their case into consideration.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The rates of pay and allowances for adjutants of Yeomanry were fixed in 1892, on the recommendation of a Committee which also reported in favour of the brigade system since introduced. The Secretary of State is of opinion that so long as the present system of training is in force there is no sufficient ground for altering the rate of pay.

HALF-PAY OFFICERS' OUTFIT ALLOWANCE.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can now state what decision has been arrived at with reference to the outfit allowance for officers from the half-pay list, which question was under consideration in May last.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The Secretary of State for War has decided to grant the outfit allowance in these cases.

RESERVE OF OFFICERS—VOLUNTEER OUTFITS.

COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether an officer of the Reserve of Officers who joined a Volunteer corps after retiring from the Regular forces is by the regulations thereby deprived of the outfit allowance granted to all other Reserve officers on rejoining the Regular Army for duty at the present time, although he has provided the Volunteer uniform he wears at his own expense; and, if this is the case, whether the regulations will be amended or instructions given that the outfit allowance is to be paid in such cases, so as to place such officers from Volunteer corps on an equal footing with all other Reserve officers.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The question is under consideration.

ACTING CHAPLAINS TO THE VOLUNTEER FORCE.

SIR BARRINGTON SIMEON (Southampton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state on what footing acting chaplains to the Volunteer forces stand, and whether they can earn a grant for their corps; and, if so, why acting chaplains attending camp this year for fifteen days were specially excluded from drawing their proper pay.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The acting chaplain earns the capitation grant for his corps like any other Volunteer. His presence in camp, except for Sunday duty, is, however, not considered necessary.

DOCKYARD EMPLOYEES AND VOLUNTEER TRAININGS—2ND VOLUNTEER BATTALION DEVONSHIRE REGIMENT.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state whether it has been decided that the dockyard employees belonging to the 2nd Volunteer Battalion Devonshire Regiment who attend the annual training will lose their pay as ordinary absentees from work, whereas workmen employed in War Office establishments are to receive full pay during the time they are embodied; and whether he will consider the advisability of placing these dockyard men on an equality with those employed by the War Office.

MR. MACARTNEY: Orders were sent to all the superintendents of the home dockyards on the 26th May last, directing that all Volunteers attending camp this year for annual training for not less than fourteen days or more than a month, are to be paid their full civil and military pay for fourteen days, and military pay for the remainder of the time, in accordance with a Treasury circular letter dated the 10th May last, addressed to all public departments. In reply to the second paragraph, I have to say that the action of the War Office will be governed by the same general instructions.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY SIDING AT ALDERSHOT.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the shed or covering for the troops ordered to be erected on the Government railway siding at Aldershot has yet been commenced; and if not, when this work will be carried out.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Tenders have been called for and the work will be begun as soon as tenders have been accepted.

IRISH ARMY AND MILITIA RECRUITS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he can say what proportion of the 41,700 recruits raised for the Army and of the 40,653 raised for Militia in 1899 were enlisted in Ireland; and whether he will also give the number for each of the two branches of the service recruited in each province and county of Ireland during 1899.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member will find all the information available on page 29 of the Annual Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting for 1899, which was presented to Parliament on the 23rd March.

MR. FLAVIN: How many of the Irish Militia recruits were school boys under the age of seventeen?

[No answer was given.]

UNDER-AGE ENLISTMENTS — ROYAL IRISH FUSILIERS—CASE OF DANIEL DUNDASS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state the circumstances attending the enlistment of Daniel Dundass in the Royal Irish Fusiliers in May of last year, who at the time of enlistment was but seventeen years of age, and the reason why when his father applied for his discharge it was not granted.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Under the regulations a recruit if under seventeen years of age and claimed by his parents is at once discharged. If over seventeen his retention in the service rests entirely with the General Officer commanding the district, with whose discretion the Secretary of State does not interfere.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then why was not this boy discharged when his father claimed him?

*MR. WYNDHAM: He had already reached the age of seventeen years, and the discretion rested, therefore, with the General Officer commanding the district.

CHINA — ANTI-FOREIGN DISTURBANCES — COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Government have received any official communications from the Chinese Government regarding the present disturbances in China; and, if so, whether he can inform the House of the purport of such communications.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (MR. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): No communications have taken place with the Chinese Government since the present crisis became acute, and all telegraphic communication interrupted. In the earlier stages of the movement repeated warnings, as I have already stated, were addressed to the Yamen by Her Majesty's Minister with regard to the state of affairs in Shantung and Chihli, and the murder of Mr. Brooks, a British missionary in the former province.

THE CAPTURE OF THE TA-KU FORTS.

MR. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether the Government are in possession of and will state the terms of the ultimatum reported to have been delivered on the part of the Allied Powers immediately prior to the bombardment of the forts at Ta-ku.

*MR. BRODRICK: The reports received from our naval officers merely stated that the forts opened fire on the fleets between twelve and one on the morning of the 17th, and make no mention of any ultimatum.

RECENT FIGHTING AT TIENTSIN—POSITION AT PEKING—ADMIRAL SEYMOUR'S OPERATIONS.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): Have the Government any recent information as to China?

*MR. BRODRICK: No definite information has, I regret to say, reached us since Friday last from Tientsin, and we are still without any news from Admiral Seymour's force and the Peking Legations. The Admiralty have received a telegram from Rear-Admiral Bruce at Ta-ku, through Chefoo, June 24th—

> "The total force which left Tientsin with the Commander-in-Chief for Peking about 2,000, composed of detachments of the allied ships. No action could possibly be taken to relieve the Commander-in-Chief, because it was only known he was cut off by Tientsin being invested Tientsin has been fighting for its life ever since. It was on receipt of information that Chinese army had ordered trains for attacking Tientsin, ravaging Tongku, and were reinforcing Ta-ku as well as mining the mouth of the Peiho, that it was promptly determined to seize Ta-ku just in time, since when every effort has been made to relieve Tientsin. Have commandeered small coasting steamer for taking troops, sick and wounded across the bar to Wei-hai-wei, where I intend making temporary base hospital and asylum for refuge."

We learn that an attempt which was made on Thursday to open communications between Ta-ku and Tientsin by a body of Americans and Russians was frustrated by the opposition of a large body of Chinese. Since then the Hong Kong troops have arrived, and it is believed about 3,000 Japanese, 1,000 Germans, and some 2,000 French troops have either arrived or are about to arrive, but we have no information as to any operations which may have been undertaken.

*SIR J. COLOMB: Arising out of that answer, may I ask whether, in consequence of Admiral Seymour having been sent in command of the international forces on land, the Russian Admiral becomes the senior officer of the international forces on the water; and whether this situation arises out of express directions from the Foreign Office or by the orders of the Admiralty?

*MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Gentleman had better address the question to the First Lord of the Admiralty.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Have the Government come to any decision as to the sending of a general officer to command the British troops in China?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think that notice of questions on this subject should be handed in.

EMPEROR OF CHINA—POSITION AND POLITICAL VIEWS.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Government have any information as to the present position and political views of the Emperor of China which they can give to the House.

*MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid I am not in a position to give the hon. Member any information on the subject.

RUSSIAN FORCES IN NORTH-WESTERN CHINA.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Government have any information to the effect that a Russian force of some 40,000 men has entered North-Western China from Kiachta and is marching upon Urga, the Mongolian capital.

*MR. BRODRICK: The answer is, No.

BRITISH TRADE WITH CHINA.

MR. DRAGE (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state what are the latest figures in the possession of the Board with regard to the value of the total British trade with China; and whether he can further state what is the value of the trade of China with the United Kingdom, with the Colonies, and India respectively.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): According to the Chinese returns of trade the value of the trade of China with the British Empire in 1899 was £43,084,000. The division of this amount into trade with the United Kingdom, India, and the Colonies cannot be accurately made, because more than one-half of the total is entered as trade with Hong Kong, and the ultimate destination of this trade cannot be stated. The Chinese returns show the value of the direct trade with the United Kingdom to be £8,147,000, with British India £5,064,000, with other British colonies and possessions (excluding Hong Kong) £1,283,000, and with Hong Kong £28,590,000. Of course, a certain part of the last-mentioned amount is destined for countries outside the British Empire.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY–RAILWAYS IN ASIA MINOR.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has informed Her Majesty's Government of the existence of an Imperial Iradé by the Sultan giving to Russian subjects the monopoly of making railways in an area of Asia Minor fronting the Black Sea.

*MR. BRODRICK: The information given in my answer of the 21st instant as to the existence and nature of an Imperial Iradé on this subject was received from Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople. The text of the Iradé has not been communicated to the Ambassador nor has any official communication been made to Her Majesty's Government on the subject.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in order to force this concession the Russian Government mobilised over 100,000 men on the Turkish frontier?

*MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member had better give notice of such an important question.

INDIAN RAILWAY STOCK.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state the maximum amount of Great Indian Peninsula 5 per cent. Stock held by the Trustees of the Sinking Fund of the D Annuities of the East Indian Railway and upon what date, whether he will give the names of the Trustees of the Sinking Fund, and whether he will state upon whose authority the Great Indian Peninsula Stock was sold and upon what dates; and whether he will state upon what date he gave notice of the intention of the Government of India to exercise its right of purchasing the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The management of the Sinking Fund of the D Annuities of the East Indian Railway Company is a matter in which the Secretary of State for India has no concern, and over which he has no control. From Returns published in the *London Gazette* it would seem that the maximum amount of Great Indian Peninsular 5 per cent. Stock held by the Trustees of the Fund was £3,544 9s. 6d., and that this amount was held by them from July 1894 to July 1898. Under the Act 55 Vict., cap. 10, the Trustees of the Deferred Annuity Holders' Sinking Fund are the Governor and the Deputy Governor of the Bank of England, and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Company for the time being. I do not know upon what authority or at what date or dates the Great Indian Peninsular Stock was sold. Notice of the intention to purchase the Great Indian Peninsular Railway was given on the 18th of August, 1899.

INDIA — OPIUM v. FOOD CULTIVATION.

MR. COLVILLE (Lanarkshire, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has any official information showing that there are areas of land in India suitable for the raising of food which are at present used for the production of the opium plant; and, if so, whether the Government will, having regard to the famine in India, take steps to have this land recovered for the production of food.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I do not think the hon. Member would appreciably increase the food supply of India, as the area occupied by opium is about 500,000 acres out of a total cultivatable area of 223,000,000 acres.

JAMAICA RUM—EXCISE RESTRICTIONS.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to the surtax on rum, if he will explain why the Reports issued in response to his invitation to the representative bodies of the Royal Agricultural Society and the Sugar Planters' Association of Jamaica, which set out the local excise restrictions and their effect on the cost of production of rum, were not included in the Return recently published; whether further official correspondence has been received from Trinidad, and whether, under the circumstances, he will allow an additional Paper embodying these omitted Reports and further correspondence to be laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Reports referred to were not included in the Return, as they did not come within the scope of the Order of the House of Commons of the 13th of February, but were furnished for the information of Her Majesty's Government in response to a separate despatch addressed only to certain West Indian colonies. There is no objection to laying further correspondence before the House as asked by the hon. Member.

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH BILL —INTERVENTION OF COLONIAL GOVERNORS.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received any remonstrances from Australia, or from the Australian delegates in England, against the intervention of Lord Lamington and Lord Beauchamp in the discussion on the Commonwealth Bill.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been called to the action of the Governor of New South Wales in taking part in the controversy on the Amendment to this Bill?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member had better give notice of that question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will do so for to-morrow.

BOUNTIES IN THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state which of the Australian colonies have exercised the power of granting bounties on the production or export of commodities, and upon what commodities bounties are given.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: So far as I am aware the Australian colonies which grant bounties at present are Victoria and Queensland. Information as to the bounties given in these colonies will be found in Parliamentary Papers C 7960 of 1896 and House of Commons No. 144 of 1899, to which I have to refer the hon. Member. From 1893 to 1896 South Australia gave a bounty of 2d. a pound on the export of butter.

GOLD COAST COLONY—CONCESSIONS ORDINANCE.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon, etc.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will inform the House if he has accepted the Amendments of the Legislative Council of the Gold Coast Colony in the draft concessions ordinance as made in the Committee stage of the ordinance in the colony; and whether the Bill has been sent back for Third Reading.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Amendments to which the hon. and learned Member refers have, in all but a few cases, been accepted. The Bill will be sent back for amendment on these points and for Third Reading at an early date.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE COMPANY'S CHARGES.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Gas Light and Coke Company have just issued notice to their consumers raising the price of gas to 3s. 5d. per 1,000 feet, and that these notices state that the enhanced price will be charged from the date of recording meter indices for the June quarter, the company thus claiming to charge the enhanced rate for gas consumed during a week or ten days, or even longer, before the notices were served; and whether he will exercise the powers vested in him by section 45 of the Metropolis Gas Act, 1860, which (*inter alia*) provides that if it appears to the Secretary of State that a metropolitan gas company is acting in a manner unauthorised by law, and it would be for the public advantage that the gas company should be restrained from so acting, he may set the Attorney General in motion to take proceedings at law to restrain the wrongful action of the company.

MR. RITCHIE: This applies to the Board of Trade. I am not aware of any obligation upon the company to give notice of their intention to raise the price of gas. The obligation to give such notice imposed by the Metropolis Gas Act, 1860, no longer exists. It was superseded by the sliding scale provisions applicable to the various companies.

FOREIGN GOODS AND BRITISH MARKS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that the manufacturers, workmen, and workwomen engaged in the production of decorated tin boxes for biscuits, music, chocolate for the Queen's soldiers, tobacco, cigarettes, tea, coffee, etc., as well as toys and other articles, are being injured by the importation of foreign goods bearing the name of English firms and English words, creating the belief that the goods are British made; and can he say how the passage of such goods through the Custom House without a definite indication of foreign origin can be reconciled with Section 16 of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, which requires such indication upon all goods of foreign manufacture bearing any name or trade mark being, or purporting to be, the name or trade mark of any manufacturer, dealer, or trader in the United Kingdom; and will he issue directions that the law is to be obeyed to the letter.

MR. HANBURY: The Board of Customs inform me that in the opinion of their solicitor "goods" in Section 16 of the Merchandise Marks Act of 1887 means goods which are themselves for sale as distinct from the mere coverings such as the boxes. I think it is a point upon which it would be satisfactory to take the opinion of the law officers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: May I send the right hon. Gentleman specimens to which these complaints actually refer?

MR. HANBURY: Certainly.

LEEK POST OFFICE.

MR. BILL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, considering the present accommodation for the public at the existing post office in Leek, the Postmaster General will take into immediate consideration the provision of more commodious premises.

MR. HANBURY: The need for a larger post office at Leek is admitted, and an advertisement for suitable sites or premises has recently been issued. The numerous offers received in reply to that advertisement are under consideration.

THE POST OFFICE AND THE NATIONAL TELEPHONE COMPANY.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether it is an instruction to postmasters in the country and generally not to forward telegraphic messages over the wires of the National Telephone Company; and, if so, will he explain why this new policy, exemplified in such an instruction, has been adopted.

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General does not now undertake to deliver telegrams by telephone to subscribers of the National Telephone Company who may apply for the privilege, but it has not been withdrawn from any subscribers to whom it has been accorded in the past.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: When was this extraordinary new principle introduced?

MR. HANBURY: I do not see that it is extraordinary. The hon. Member must realise that there are obvious disadvantages in the Post Office entering into what is practically a partnership with a private company, especially a private company which is itself in direct competition with the Post Office and persistently refuses similar facilities to Post Office subscribers.

CASUAL EMPLOYMENT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN.

MR. DRAGE: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he has had under his consideration the state of affairs revealed in the Parliamentary Return on the casual employment of children for wages, issued by the Education Department in June, 1899; and whether he is prepared to introduce into the Bill to amend the Elementary Education Acts clauses to protect such children by a system of local bye-laws, to be enforced by the police, prohibiting such employment between certain ages and certain hours, and forbidding any child to be so employed without a licence.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. While I sympathise strongly with the views and suggestions of the hon. Member, I have little doubt that an attempt to deal with the matter in the Education Bill of this session would imperil its passing into law.

STORNOWAY SECONDARY EDUCATION SCHOOL.

MR. HEDDERWICK; I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been called to the fact that the parish of Stornoway, in Lewis, has recently erected a school at Stornoway for secondary education at a cost of over £3,500; whether, under the operation of the Education (Scotland) Bill now before the House, some of the grants at present applied by the local authorities to the relief of rates would be withdrawn from that purpose, and an increase of rates which, owing to the largeness of the population and the lowness of the valuation, already amount to several shillings in the £, would in consequence be necessitated; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am aware that the School Board of Stornoway have, a few months ago, raised a loan of more than £3,000 for school building. It would be premature at present to attempt to forecast what may be the financial effect of the Bill now before the House in particular instances. But the effect of that Bill would be to devote to educational purposes any sum withdrawn from relief of rates, and thus add to the educational resources of the various localities.

ILLEGAL FISHING IN LOCH FYNE.

SIR CHARLES CAMERON (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the attention of the Scottish Fishery Board has been called to the prevalence of illegal fishing in Loch Fyne, and the inadequacy of the sailing cutter "Daisy" for its suppression, and whether it is proposed to take any steps to render the policing of the waters more efficient.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed by the Fishery Board that one complaint as to daylight fishing in Loch Fyne was received from Glasgow a few days ago, and is now being investigated, but as yet no confirmation has been obtained by them. They are of opinion that with the continuous presence there of the "Daisy" and the frequent visits of the "Vigilant," the supervision of the fishing in Loch Fyne is sufficiently provided for.

NAVAL RECRUITING IN THE HIGHLANDS—TRAINING SHIPS.

MR. HEDDERWICK: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will consider the propriety of stationing a training ship at Portree, in the Island of Skye, to diffuse a knowledge of the benefits of the Naval Service, and act as a recruiting centre for the Navy in the Hebrides.

MR. MACARTNEY: It is not proposed to add to the present number of stationary training ships.

GREAT NORTHERN OF IRELAND RAILWAY—CLONES LEVEL CROSSING.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether effect has been given to his promise to have an inspector sent to Clones, county Monaghan, to examine the level crossing on the Great Northern Railway there, and also the island platform, where the space between the waiting room side-wall and the edge of the line is but three feet; and has a report been made on the matter.

MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sir; an inspecting officer of the Board of Trade has recently visited Clones, but his report has not yet been made. When it has been received I shall have pleasure in communicating with the hon. Member.

COOTEHILL (MONAGHAN) POST-MASTERSHIP.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether any applications were received from qualified postal servants for the postmastership of Cootehill which recently became vacant; and whether any appointment has been made, and, if so, whether the office has been given to a member of the service or to a person outside the service; and, if the latter, will he explain why existing and willing postal servants were passed over.

MR. HANBURY: Applications were received from four postal servants for the sub-postmastership of Cootehill, Monaghan. An appointment has been made in this case, the selected candidate being a person outside the service. It was considered necessary, in order that an efficient control might be exercised over the twelve established and auxiliary postmen attached to the Cootehill sub-office, that a man should be appointed. Of the four applicants already in the Post Office service, three are women, and therefore unsuitable candidates. The fourth, who is not an established officer of the department, does not reside at Cootehill, and on this ground was passed over in favour of a candidate resident in the town and eligible in all respects.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS IN IRELAND.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether he has considered the representation of the Philanthropic Reform Association in favour of passing into law this session Clauses 3 to 18 of the Youthful Offenders Bill; and whether he will assist in enabling county councils of any county in Ireland to enter into an agreement with the directors or managers of any certified reformatory school in England or Scotland to receive Protestant girls from Ireland for whom no reformatory exists in that country, and so amend the law as to permit Irish justices to commit to a reformatory school in England or Scotland.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative, but I am unable at present to say anything definite. The matter raised in the second paragraph is one rather for the Irish Government, with whom I am in communication.

IRISH TEACHERS' EXAMINATIONS.

SIR THOMAS LEA (Londonderry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the officers of the National Education Board of Ireland, in considering the claims of teachers for admission to examinations for promotion, are guided entirely by the comments contained in the inspectors' minutes without considering the marks assigned in the examination roll; and whether this procedure as a means of discovering the efficient and energetic teachers, who should be summoned to examination for promotion, has been sanctioned by the Government.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): In considering the claims of teachers for promotion the Commissioners have at all times taken into account every element in the inspectors' reports that bear on the question of the teacher's merit. The matter is entirely one for the Commissioners, and the Government have nothing to say to it.

PRETORIA RELIEF CELEBRATIONS AT DOWNPATRICK.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give any information as to the proceedings in Downpatrick on Tuesday, the 5th inst., when there was rejoicing on the part of the loyalists in consequence of the entry of Lord Roberts into Pretoria; whether he is aware that the procession of persons bearing the Union Jack was prevented by the police from going, as usual on such occasions, up Irish Street, one of the principal streets of the town; and that loyalists were batoned by the police, and ordered on recent occasions to stop singing "God Save the Queen"; and whether he will cause a public sworn inquiry to be instituted into the whole conduct of the public and the police in Downpatrick on Pretoria Day.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: It is the fact that the police at Downpatrick prevented the loyalist procession on the occasion mentioned from marching through Irish Street, but it is not true to say that it is usual on such occasions for processions to pass along this street. On the contrary, it has been the ordinary practice, for a number of years, to prevent them from doing so, and the arrangement has been acquiesced in by the leaders of the Orangemen. Loyalists have not been ordered, as alleged, to stop singing "God Save the Queen," and the police did not use their batons on the 5th inst. until their cordon had been broken and they had been struck with sticks and flagpoles. The police are satisfied that in acting as they did on the night of the 5th inst. a a very serious conflict between the opposite parties was averted. Proceedings are about to be instituted against a number of persons for assaults on the police arising out of the disturbances, and all the facts will doubtless be fully investigated by the magistrates.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman grant a public sworn inquiry?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I see no reason for it, at any rate until the magisterial investigation is completed.

NEW QUAY (CLARE) WATER SUPPLY.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the condition of the water supply at New Quay, county Clare; and if he can state what steps have been taken in the matter by the Irish Local Government Board.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The Local Government Board have requested the Rural District Council to obtain from the medical officer of health a report as to the sufficiency and purity of the existing water supply at New Quay. The matter will continue to receive the attention of the Board.

ARDGLASS (CO. DOWN) HERRING FISHERY.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether recently any complaints have been made on the part of the fishermen of Ardglass, county Down, as to the falling off of the herring fishery there; whether this is traceable to the presence of steam trawlers fishing within the three-mile limit; and whether the inspectors of Irish fisheries have power to take steps further to extend the limit; and if so, will they take action concerning the matter.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKETT, Dublin County, S.): Representations have been made to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction to the effect stated in the first and second paragraphs of the question. The Department, however, have been informed by the local coastguards that they have not observed any steam trawling within the prohibited limits. I do not think the Department has power to make a bye-law prohibiting trawling outside the territorial limits, but I may observe that the question of the best means of protecting the Irish fisheries from the depredations of the trawlers is at present engaging the most careful consideration of the Department.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the Department of the right hon. Gentleman try and induce the Government to send a cruiser to protect these fisheries from the steam trawlers?

MR. PLUNKETT: I believe the Government have decided that they cannot undertake that work.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then what is the good of the Navy to us?

MR. FLAVIN: Is there any general law, or bye-law, preventing trawlers coming within the three-mile limit?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice had better be given of that question.

KERRY MACKEREL FISHERIES.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to the destruction of the nets of mackerel fishing boats by steam trawlers off the western coast of county Kerry, especially in the Cahirciveen district and the Shannon's mouth; is he aware that the fishing boat "Betsy," from Cahirciveen, during one night last month lost nets worth £100; and will he say if steam trawlers are allowed to come within the three-mile limit, whether any complaints have been made to the Secretary of Irish Fisheries, and what steps have been taken for the better protection of the property of the fishermen engaged in the fishing industry on the coast of Kerry.

MR. PLUNKETT: Complaints have been made of the nature mentioned in this question. With regard to the third paragraph, I can only repeat what has already been stated by me, that the question of the best means of enforcing the existing bye-laws prohibiting trawling, and of protecting the Irish fisheries from the depredations of trawlers, is at present engaging the most careful consideration of the Department.

MR. FLAVIN: Is there any bye-law in existence, either at Cahirciveen or the Shannon's mouth, to prevent steam trawlers coming within the three-mile limit? If not, will the right hon. Gentleman take steps with a view to getting one passed?

MR. PLUNKETT: I must ask for notice of that question.

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS AND THE IRISH LABOURERS ACTS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether a labourer is disqualified from acting as district councillor by reason of his having obtained a plot of land under the Irish Labourers Acts, the said plot having been entirely purchased by money advanced by the Government, and the tenant's rent now going to relief of local rates.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The Irish Local Government Board have acted on the assumption that the labourer is disqualified, but proceedings have been or are about to be instituted to obtain a judicial decision on the point. It would hardly be proper for me under these circumstances to express an opinion on the abstract question put.

PRIVATE BILL COMMITTEES—SELECTION OF MEMBERS.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Watford, as Chairman of the Committee of Selection, whether the Committee have experienced any difficulty in giving effect to the Instruction of the House, given on the 21st of February last year, that in selecting Members to serve on Committees for the consideration of Private Bills equal consideration shall be granted to any Member on the ground of his private profession, business, or avocation; whether he can state the number of members of the learned professions actively engaged in practice who have served on Private Bill Committees last session and this session respectively; and if he will furnish a list of those Members who have not served on any Private Bill Committee during the past three sessions.

*MR. HALSEY (Hertfordshire, Watford): In answer to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question, I have to say that the Committee of Selection have not experienced any special difficulty in carrying out the instruction of the House to which the hon. Member refers. With regard to the second paragraph of the question, the hon. Member can, I think, obtain the information he requires for last session by examining the Sessional Return relating to Private Bills and Private Business, No. 0.273, but it would obviously be impossible to give the information for the present session until the Private Business of the year is concluded. The third paragraph only appeared on the Paper on Saturday, and I have had no notice of it, but it appears to be in the nature of a Return, which should be moved for in the ordinary way. I may point out that Returns of all Members who have served on Committees are moved for at the end of every session, and the hon. Member can easily obtain the information he desires by comparing those Returns with a list of the House.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—EXTENSION TO SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

COLONEL PRYCE-JONES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will consider the advisability of introducing an Amendment to Section 8 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, so that persons in the Naval and Military service of the Crown or their dependents may be entitled to all that compensation for injuries received which they would have been able to claim for injuries sustained in civil employment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Member must have mistaken my intention. All I said in answer to a similar question was that the matter was being dealt with by the Government.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS—SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL—MIDWIVES BILL.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, having regard to the memorial presented to him by 198 Members of Parliament representing all parties, asking Her Majesty's Government to grant special facilities for passing into law this session the Bill for Prohibiting the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children, and, considering the interest felt in the country in respect of this Bill, whether he will accede to the request contained in the memorial.

MR. EGERTON (Cheshire, Knutsford): Will the right hon. Gentleman, before answering the question, consider whether he will grant similar facilities for a Bill equally important—namely, the Midwives Bill, which has passed through the Grand Committee?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will answer the two questions together. In answer to the right hon. Gentleman I have to say that I am well aware that the Bill to which he refers is one which, both in the country and in the House, has excited a great deal of interest and commands a great deal of support. [AN HON. MEMBER: And opposition, too.] The suggestion made, I think, by the right hon. Gentleman when we were discussing the taking of the time of the House on Monday last was that an additional Wednesday in addition to the two already granted should be given to private Members so as to give this Bill and other private Members' Bills a chance of coming on.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is not my suggestion. I made no definite suggestion.

AN HON. MEMBER: You never do.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: At all events, the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to say that he gave a hint.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir. I only adduced the case of this Bill as a flagrant instance of the unfair way in which our rules at the present time work. That was the whole scope of what I said. I dwelt upon the effect on this Bill of that unfair action.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course, I do not dispute the right hon. Gentleman's interpretation of his own speech. At all events, I took a different view at the time, and I took some trouble after that speech to consider whether the granting of an additional Wednesday would have any effect on this Bill. Looking over the measures which necessarily stand before it under the rules, I found that the granting neither of one Wednesday nor of two or even three Wednesdays would probably have any effect on its fate. There then remains to be considered the only alternative policy, which is whether additional ordinary Government time should be given to the Bill—whether it should be given, in other words, privileges as a Government measure. I am not aware that that has ever been done for a controversial measure, except with the single case of the Eight Hours (Miners) Bill, and I do not think that that is an example which would induce any leader of the House to favour exceptions of this character. I am convinced that if the right hon. Gentleman were in my place, and if he were of opinion that this was a controversial Bill, he would find it impossible to grant the facilities he asks. There remains only the question whether this is a controversial Bill or not. I have taken some pains to make myself acquainted with its prospects as a controversial measure, and I understand that those who think it uncontroversial do so because it passed the Second Reading with little or no discussion. It must be borne in mind by the House that the Second Reading came on under very unexpected circumstances, by a Parliamentary accident, and that what occurred on that occasion offers no sufficient indication of the degree to which the Bill would be opposed if it came on at a well-known and fixed time for Parliamentary discussion. Of course, it would be quite out of order now to discuss the merits of the Bill, but I observe it does contain two principles which I am quite certain would lead to a considerable amount of discussion. In the first place, it lays down that the publican who does not know the age of a child, and who necessarily has no means of knowing it, is to be punished for giving that child liquor, while the parent who does know the age is not to be punished for sending the child to get liquor. That is a point on which there must be discussion. Another point is that, while it is to be made illegal to send for liquor a boy of fifteen, it is to be legal to send a girl of sixteen. That is a point which will, and which ought to, provoke discussion in this House; and in these circumstances it is impossible for me to regard the Bill as an uncontroversial measure. That being the case, it is in accordance with the principle which not only I, but my predecessors, have followed, to decline the suggestion made by the right hon. Gentleman.

INDIAN BUDGET.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will arrange for a day to be set apart at an early date for the discussion of the condition of affairs in India arising out of the existence of plague and famine.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have already indicated to the House, on a day when the hon. Member was not present, that I intended, under the special circumstances of the present year, to give a favourable opportunity for the discussion of the Indian Budget. The actual day I am not yet in a position to fix.

THE GOVERNMENT AND IRISH NATIONALIST MEMBERS — APPOINTMENT OF MR. GILL IN IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

MR. BUTCHER (York): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, to whom I have given private notice of the question, whether his attention has been called to a letter appearing in the *Morning Post* on Friday last from the hon. Member for Stoke, in which he refers to the recent appointment of Mr. Gill to a post in Ireland, and uses these words—

> "Now we know what the bargain was between the Government and the Nationalist party. The Nationalists were not to object

to the creation of a new office for Mr. Horace Plunkett's benefit, and in return they were to be allowed a share of the booty in the minor appointments."

I should like to ask whether that statement, as to a corrupt bargain between the Nationalist party and the Government, has any foundation in fact.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. friend I have to say that there is not a shadow of foundation for the statement.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR reported from the Chairmen's Panel: That they had appointed Sir James Fergusson to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure in respect of the Executors (Scotland) Bill, the County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill, and the Veterinary Surgeons Amendment Bill, and that they had appointed Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure in respect of the Elementary Education Bill.

Report to lie upon the Table.

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION BILL.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): Before I move the Amendment which stands in my name on the Paper, I wish to refer to a matter included incidentally in the Amendment of my hon. friend the Member for Stepney. The words I desire to introduce after the words, "other than a rural district council," are these, "and including a London borough council." This is only to make the intention clear, because it is obvious from the statement in the Amendment that he does mean to give powers to a London borough council to establish lodging-houses outside the district. I quite agree that it may seem at first sight that the words I propose are unnecessary; but on consideration I think there is a doubt, and that the safe course would be to put them in, and for this reason: a London borough council stands in a totally different position from any other council. The power which is now given to a London borough council is not included in any of the series of Acts which are called the Housing of the Working Classes Acts. The position of a London borough council is also exceptional in this respect: that in the Act of last session there is an express provision that the powers with regard to housing so far as a London borough council is concerned shall not be exercised outside the district of the borough council, whereas as regards all the others it is merely an implication drawn from general words. For these reasons, in order at all events to call the attention of the Attorney General to the point, I beg to move the insertion of these words.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, after the word 'Council,' to insert the words 'and including a London Borough Council.'"—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I quite understand the object of the hon. Member in calling attention to this matter, but I believe the Amendment is altogether unnecessary. The words of the clause are: "Where any council other than a rural district council." These words would include a London borough council. I understand that powers to acquire land were given to the London borough councils in the London Government Act.

MR. PICKERSGILL: With the express limitation that they are not to build outside their areas.

MR. CHAPLIN: If that be so, that express limitation is overridden by the words in the Bill which I have pointed out.

MR. PICKERSGILL: I cannot see any harm in inserting the words; but if the right hon. Gentleman is advised by the legal advisers that the words are unnecessary, I will not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. PICKERSGILL: I think it is very desirable, and, indeed, necessary, that the words I now propose, or words of a similar character, should be introduced into the first clause. The first clause really provides that the councils shall have power to establish and acquire lodging-houses outside their districts. The words "establish or acquire" only occur once in the principal Act—namely, in Section 61, where they are introduced incidentally, and do not throw much light on the meaning which is to be attached to them. In the principal Act there is no allusion to or explanation of the words "establish or acquire." As regards the part of my Amendment which relates to the acquiring of land, it is true that Section 57 of the principal Act empowers a local authority to acquire land for the purposes of Part III. of that Act, but according to the accepted construction of the statute the land there is limited within the district. Therefore, we are really thrown back on the question I raised first of all as to what the words "establish or acquire lodging houses" really include. With regard to the second part of my Amendment, which proposes to introduce the words "hold land," I think those words very important. We are for the first time giving to urban authorities the opportunity of going outside their own districts to provide housing accommodation for the teeming populations. It seems to me an almost necessary corollary from that proposition that you should also give to those urban communities power to acquire land outside their own districts before that land has attained a prohibitive price. If that is not done it seems to me perfectly clear that the full advantage which might be expected from this new departure we are about to make will certainly not be realised. I have now explained both heads of my Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'district,' to insert the words 'acquire and hold land and.'"—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHAPLIN: I am still not quite clear as to what the hon. Member means precisely by "holding land." It seems to me in any case to be unnecessary for the purposes of this Bill, because it must be obvious that a local authority cannot "establish" lodging-houses for the working classes without acquiring land upon which those lodging-houses would be built. It seems to me, therefore, if that is what it means, that the Amendment is unnecessary. If, on the other hand, it means something more than this—powers to acquire and hold land irrespective of the houses altogether—that is another and a different question, which should form an Amendment to the Public Health Act, under which powers are provided if needed, but they are not needed. If the hon. Member will turn to Section 175 of the Public Health Act, 1875, he will find that "any local authority may for the purposes and subject to the provisions of this Act purchase or take on lease, sell or exchange, any land whether situated within or without their district." Then there is a provision that any land acquired by a local authority in pursuance of any of the powers of that Act, and not required for the purposes for which they were acquired, unless the Local Government Board otherwise direct, "shall be sold at the best price that can be gotten for the same." In such a case as the hon. Gentleman suggests they might buy land at some time for the purpose of providing houses, and afterwards come before the Local Government Board for a dispensation, and the dispensation having been given, provision is made in another clause of the Act of 1875 as to the disposal of that kind of land until it is needed for houses. So far as I am able to form an opinion, everything the hon. Member desires is already provided for.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I do not think the right hon. Gentleman has quite appreciated the Amendment now before the Committee. In the existing Act there is power to acquire land for the purpose of erecting houses for the working classes. In the Bill which is before us there is added the power of acquiring land for the purpose of erecting lodging houses on areas outside the jurisdiction of the authority concerned. But what I imagine my hon. friend has in view is that we have in London an enormous and almost incalculable increment of population going on week by week and month by month. It almost defies the London County Council to master that question at any one moment. The effect of my hon. friend's Amendment would be that a broad and comprehensive scheme might be devised for taking over by the municipality of any great town, a suitable area of land for prospective development of working-class dwellings in the years to come. I ask the right hon. Gentleman and hon. Members who have considered the gravity of this problem if they do not think that that is a proposal of enormous importance, which would go a very long way to make this Bill really useful in the near future. It seems to be absolutely imperative that you should deal with this question in such a way that a local authority shall not be stopped and crushed out of its undertaking to provide for the dwellings of the poor by enormous enhancements of those land values in the immediate districts to the large towns. Undoubtedly, the result of the first clause of this Bill as it now stands would be to throw an enormous and rapidly-increasing unearned increment into the hands of the owners of the suburban land which may be employed for this purpose. It is only reasonable, having regard to the future wants of a great community like London, that you should extend the right to acquire suitable land which may be required for building in the districts surrounding great towns, when by buying at the present value the land can be got for a reasonable amount, in order that there should be a great economy effected in the interests of the ratepayers, and in the interest still more of those inhabiting the crowded parts of London and other great towns. I sincerely hope that my hon. friend will persevere in this Amendment. The issues at stake are of such vast importance with respect to the future of those who dwell in great towns that I hope Her Majesty's Government, before the discussion closes, will meet the Amendment in some more favourable way than the right hon. Gentleman has done.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): The law upon this subject is somewhat difficult and complicated, but it depends upon Acts of Parliament, and what I would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General is this. Supposing the London County Council were able to get at a proper price a considerable area of land under favourable conditions outside their own district and were willing to buy it with a view of erecting workmen's dwellings, but not at once—if they wished to keep it in their own hands, and not lease it to any person—under the law as it now stands, and under the Bill as it now stands, would it be possible for the County Council to do so? If it would, then the Amendment of my hon. friend is superfluous and unnecessary; but if the clause as it now stands does not empower a thing of that kind to be done, then an Amendment ought to be incorporated in the Bill to make it possible. It might possibly be brought in in a more convenient form later on, but that is not the question.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): In answer to the question of my hon. and learned friend, it appears to me that Section 175 of the Public Health Act of 1875—under which the London County Council could acquire any land which is really wanted for the purpose of erecting lodging-houses, and hold it for a reasonable time subject to the discretion of the Local Government Board—would cover it. I apprehend that discretion would be exercised in this sense: that if there was a reasonable prospect in the near future of the land being actually wanted for the purpose, the Council would be allowed to retain it. Only it is not intended that the Council should be allowed to enter into land speculation.

MR. MADDISON (Sheffield, Brightside) said the Amendment of the hon. Member for South-west Bethnal Green had not been met by the answer of the hon. and learned Gentleman. If this Bill, or any Bill of this kind, was going to touch the great problem of the housing of the people, it would not have to be determined in a narrow spirit by the reading of another Act which might or might not apply to this particular purpose. The housing question was neither more nor less than the land question. Therefore, when the hon. Member for South-west Bethnal Green sought to give to these local authorities power to acquire and hold land, he (Mr. Maddison) ventured to submit that he would give to this clause a value which it did not possess as it stood. After all, what was the danger in this matter? The Attorney General used some words about local authorities acquiring land for speculation purposes. He (Mr. Maddison) regretted very much that at this early stage of the discussion the bogey of municipal trading should be dragged in. For his part he had no great desire to extend municipal trading except where it was absolutely necessary; and all that he could say was that if hon. Members were going to approach this question in a niggardly spirit, if they were going to define the action of local bodies in the matter of land, they were not going to touch the problem at its roots. The Bill itself, in all truth, was something less than a moderate attempt to deal with the question, and if the question was to be dealt with in the manner he had suggested, he confessed that he had very little hope that this Bill would do any good at all. He hoped the hon. Member would press this most important Amendment to a division, because, although the Amendment might be defeated by the legions of the Government, the supporters of the Amendment would at least have registered their protest against the attempt to narrow down this new policy.

*MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea) expressed a desire to say one word upon the Amendment. He thought if it were carried it would prevent proper advantage being taken of the Act. Up to the present year the London County Council had been afraid to put into force Part III. of the Housing Act to some extent, because of the opposition of private companies. This Amendment would certainly increase that kind of opposition. He deplored the inactivity of the County Council in not going farther than they did; he wished them to put into force Clause 3. According to the statement of the Attorney General the Amendment was not really necessary if the County Council only desired to hold land for a short time, and therefore, if passed, it might tempt the County Council to acquire land prematurely in the hope that at some future time it might be required. The great object of the Bill was to meet a definite demand. It was not desired to meet demands which might be made ten years hence, and therefore he hoped the Amendment would not be accepted.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) thought there was a very wide difference between what might be termed a speculative desire to acquire land by the local authority and a reasonable desire to anticipate requirements in any part of a county. The question was important, having regard to the great problem which had arisen. Owing to the local authority desiring to anticipate its requirements, a few years ago there was a Bill passed whereby the Government undertook to spend £5,000,000, extended over a period of years, in Devonport. It was obvious that such an expenditure would bring into Devonport several thousands of working men, and the question arose as to how to house them. Supposing that had been taken into consideration before the question of land speculation set in on the part of private speculators, the local authority could have fixed on land in many districts and solved the problem. The Attorney General had pointed out that these powers already existed, but the corporations were ignorant of these powers, and had no knowledge of the powers they had. He could see no reason why the matter should not be made clear, definite, and specific in this Bill, and he could see no objection to the Amendment.

MR. CHAPLIN: I do not think there is any real difference between us. I am sure we all have the same object in view, and I will go into the matter again, and if there is the slightest doubt as to the effect of the existing law, I will have it made absolutely clear. Personally, I think the statement of my hon. friend the Attorney General is a most convincing one.

MR. WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): This is rather a serious point, because, if you buy the land retail, it will cost you about twice as much as buying it wholesale. It might be a case where ten acres only is wanted immediately, but within seven or eight years you might want fifty acres. If you bought the fifty acres at once you would then get the ten acres you want immediately at about half the price, and you would get the other forty acres very much cheaper. Not only this, but you would get a discount for taking a larger quantity. That being so, I think there is very good reason for this Amendment.

SIR BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich): In connection with this question, there is one point which has not been touched upon, and that is the question of the rates. Suppose the London County Council decided to take a large piece of ground outside the London area in Middlesex, would the London County Council be required to pay the full rates upon all the houses built by them just as if they were built by a private individual?

*THE CHAIRMAN: That does not arise upon this Amendment.

SIR BLUNDELL MAPLE: There is no doubt that in London it is advisable to buy land in large blocks, and as some of it would stand idle it would be liable to be rated. The question is whether, in such a case as I have mentioned, the county of Middlesex should receive the full rates on the land as if houses were built upon it. When you build within the area of the London County Council in the county of London, then the rates go to the benefit of the county, but when you build property outside that area that particular county gains the benefit. If the London County Council were to obtain a large piece of land near London outside the London County Council area, and lay out £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 upon buildings and in developing it, that would mean under present conditions that the rates would go into the pockets of the Middlesex County Council and not the London County Council. This is a very serious question, because we want, above all things, to encourage municipalities to build these houses for the working classes. I think some arrangement might be made whereby counties outside the area should make some allowance upon such buildings. I submit this proposal to the President of the Local Government Board as a means of encouraging the building of these houses, for it would be cheapening them if the rates were reduced.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): As far as I can see, the President of the Local Government Board has given away his case. He says that in principle he agrees with hon. Members on this side, and the only question is whether there is not power to buy this land under some existing statute. If there is this power, surely the insertion of these words will do no harm but will do a great deal of good. The clause says—

> "Establish or acquire lodging-houses for the working classes under that part outside their district."

But you cannot establish these houses unless you have the land. I wish to refer to the speech of the hon. Member for Chelsea. The hon. Member says that when ten acres are required we can go and buy them, but that is just what we have grave doubts about. It is not so easy to buy land just where and when you want it, and what we want is power to acquire the land when a favourable opportunity arises. I must say that I do not think the Government have made out any case for resisting the Amendment. If we pass the clause in its present form without the word "land" in it, which is the foundation of the whole matter, we shall not be discharging the duty which is expected of us in this matter. If the right hon. Gentleman does not make this concession, I hope we shall go to a division on this question.

MR. STEADMAN (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I am correct, I think, in stating that when this Bill was first introduced the Housing Committee of the London County Council had some correspondence with the Local Government Board, and one of the chief things which the London County Council recommended and asked the Local Government Board to do was to allow them when once acquiring land to hold that land in larger quantities in the interests of the ratepayers. I know that they brought up a recommendation on the lines upon which the hon. Member for South-west Bethnal Green is now moving his Amendment. I must congratulate the hon. Member for Chelsea upon being a new convert to the principle of housing the working classes in London. I find from my eight years experience as a member of the London County Council that the hon. Member for Chelsea and his friends have been some of the most reactionary members of that body in opposing this principle, and when the recommendation of the Housing

Committee was before the full Council neither the hon. Member for Chelsea nor the hon. Member for East Islington rose in their places and protested against the recommendation of that Committee, and yet to-day in the House, when we have an opportunity of putting on the Statute-book the very recommendation of the Council of which the hon. Gentleman is a member, he rises in his place and opposes it. But the hon. Member for Chelsea cannot blow hot at Spring Gardens and cold in the House of Commons.

MR. WHITMORE: Apparently I did not blow at all.

MR. STEADMAN: If the hon. Member did not blow at all at Spring Gardens, he did not rise in his place and protest by his voice against that recommendation the same as he has done now in the House of Commons. The hon. Member must either have agreed or disagreed with it; and if he disagreed with it as he disagrees with the Amendment of the hon. Member for South-west Bethnal Green, he should have said so, and not have waited until he had an opportunity of speaking where he knows he has got a majority of the Government supporters behind him. Assuming that the London County Council were anxious to purchase fifty acres away in Essex, Kent, Surrey, or in any other county, and for the time being they only wanted to build on ten acres, if they can get the sanction of the Local Government Board they can purchase the land. They have to tell the Local Government Board upon how many acres they are going to build for the time being, and then the Local Government Board may say, "We shall not grant you permission to purchase fifty acres, because you only intend building on ten. We will allow you to purchase ten." What will follow? In consequence of the buildings erected on that ten acres the value of the other forty acres goes up double and treble, and the ratepayers will have to pay later on for the unearned increment upon that land to the landowner. As a member of the municipality of London I have no hesitation in saying that I am in favour of purchasing all the land which that municipality can purchase, and holding it instead of allowing the increased value to go into the pockets of the landowner. In the case of land near Covent Garden, the Duke of Bedford is compelling the London County Council to pay the full commercial value, although the housing value is not more than £7,000. If the ratepayers had purchased that land in the first instance they would have got the benefit of it.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.) pointed out that when this Bill became an Act of Parliament it could only be put into operation after the Council had adopted Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said that throughout the twelve years he had been connected with the London County Council he had not blown hot and cold upon this question, but he had strenuously advocated the acquisition of land for houses for the working classes, and strenuously opposed it for any other purpose. If the London County Council, or any other county council, required land with the intention of putting working-class dwellings upon it, then they had it on the authority of the Attorney General and the President of the Local Government Board that the power would be granted. To insert this Amendment would frustrate the object hon. Members opposite desired to secure, because it would make people believe what they would not otherwise have supposed—that the object of the Amendment was to enable the London County Council, as was hinted by the hon. Member for Stepney, to indulge not merely in land speculation, but in land operations which were foreign to their purpose and entirely outside their province.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I think there is some misapprehension as to the effect of this clause, and also as to the Amendment. There can be no doubt that the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Local Government Board was perfectly right in saying that there is ample power under this clause to acquire land. In regard to that there need be no fear whatever in the mind of any hon. Member; but the Amendment raises another point which I think is well worthy of the consideration of the House and the Government. The hon. Member for Chelsea asked why should we now be called upon to provide lodging-houses for a longer period than ten years? Simply for the very reason that at the end of ten years the land will cost twice as much as it will now. That is the true reason for making this proposal. The Government say that if you take this clause as it now stands the law will be that the London County Council have the power to go outside their district to buy land for the purpose of erecting these lodging-houses upon it. They would not be empowered by this Amendment to do what my hon. friend the Member for Stepney wishes them to do, and they would have no power to speculate and acquire large tracts of country for anything approaching land nationalisation. They would, however, be able to get what they thought was necessary for supplying the needs of their district for housing the working-classes either now or ten years hence. With all due respect to my hon. friend behind me, I think the words of the Amendment are not the best that could be put in, but I mean to support this Amendment, because what I desire is that the London County Council, or any other county council not necessarily confined to London, shall not be compelled by the Local Government Board to sell land if they are not able to use it immediately for the purpose of erecting lodging-houses. I am not going to underrate the Local Government Board in this matter, but I do think that the municipality in London or elsewhere would be better able to judge as to what were the future needs of its district with regard to the erection of dwellings for the working classes than a central department. I see no possible danger likely to arise, and I do think that it would be a very great gain if this Amendment were adopted, certainly to the London County Council and the county councils of all our large towns, if they could buy a sufficient quantity of land in order to prevent that land being put up in price against them when they want to buy it at a future time, when its value will have increased in consequence of the very purchase they have made.

Mr. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes) thought the clause as it stood enabled county councils to acquire and hold land for the purpose of erecting workmen's dwellings upon it.

Mr. THORNTON (Clapham) said he had had some experience upon this question, and he had seen the co-operative system in practice. He thought municipalities would be wise in buying land in larger quantities, and the Bill would be inoperative unless municipalities had the power of holding the land for some term of years. If this Bill was to be a success they should allow this idea to be carried out.

Sir ROBERT REID: May I add one word upon the views which have been expressed. The Attorney General has told us what he understands the law to be. If the London County Council desires to buy land it may buy for immediate purposes, and it may buy land with a view to future wants. It may hold the land with the consent of the Local Government Board, but as the Attorney General told us, no doubt perfectly truly, what the Local Government Board would be likely to do would be to allow the land to be bought for immediate requirements, but if you want it for some more or less remote period you may not hold it. That is the substance of the law as stated by the Attorney General, and that is the law which my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton wishes to see amended. That is the object of this Amendment, and I do press this point upon the Government for consideration. Why should we not authorise the local authorities to acquire land to meet the needs that will arise in view of the future expansion of their districts? We do not wish to see land speculations entered upon by the local authorities, but there is a very long way between acquiring land for immediate expansions, and future expansions which may not take place for the next five or ten years; and there is a very wide difference between providing for that and providing for anything in the nature of land speculation. There is a very important principle underlying this Amendment, and I do hope the right hon. Gentleman will not be inflexible, but will consider whether some such proposal as my hon. friend has made may not be entertained.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I think the hon. Gentleman has rather misrepresented what fell from the Attorney General. The powers of local authorities to buy land and hold it for the purpose of establishing lodging-houses are absolutely unfettered, and there is no restriction upon them whatever. Then comes the question as to what is to be done with that land if it is not required for the purpose for which it was bought. It is only under those circumstances that the land must be sold, and I am fortified in this view by the opinion of the Attorney General. The Amendment is absolutely unnecessary, for all the powers exist at the present moment under the present law to do what hon. Gentlemen opposite desire, and which we on this side desire no less than they do. It is perfectly clear that there is no substantial difference of opinion between us. I said that I would reconsider this matter if my hon. friend desired it, and in consultation with the Attorney General I will satisfy myself as to whether or not the statement I made in the earlier part of the debate was absolutely correct, and if the present law does not provide for the view which I have expressed, we will make it perfectly clear in the Bill. I agree very largely with my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton, but I believe that the views of the hon. Gentleman opposite are fully met by the existing law.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said it was of the utmost importance that the old definition of surplus land should be varied for the purposes of this Act.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman has made a very fair offer if it includes all that we on this side of the House are asking for, but that is a point on which we are not quite clear. The right hon. Gentleman says that the law as it stands will do all that is asked for on this side of the House, but does the right hon. Gentleman understand that the powers we ask for include the holding of land for the prospective wants of a district? If that is so, and if the right hon. Gentleman and the Attorney General agree to look into the words to see if they really carry that out, then I think that most of us will be satisfied with that undertaking. But our point is that it should include the prospective wants, and not merely immediate requirements at the time the acquisition of the land is made, and that is the whole matter.

MR. CHAPLIN: The local authority can acquire land for prospective use at any future period whatever, subject to the condition—"unless the Local Government Board otherwise direct."

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I do not quite accept the statement that there is no doubt as to what the meaning of this provision is. The Attorney General made it clear that unless this land was wanted for immediate use within a reasonable time the Local Government Board would be bound to direct its sale. I will make this suggestion, which I think my hon. friend behind me will accept. My suggestion is to add the words "for supplying the present and future needs of the district." I think those words would make the meaning perfectly clear. There would not be very much of a concession in this case, because the right hon. Gentleman says he is satisfied that the power is there already; but what we want is to introduce something about which there will be no misconception, either on the one side or the other, as to what the meaning really is. We do not want any land speculations, but we do want power in order that the county council may hold land for a period of ten years or more if necessary. They should have power to buy a certain quantity of land to supply the future needs of their districts.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I understand the right hon. Gentleman not to differ from me as to the law on the subject, but he has made it clear that what he wants is some alteration of the law as contained in Section 157 of the Public Health Act, 1875. The aspirations expressed by hon. Gentlemen opposite were in some respects of a rather vague character, and before saying that we are disposed to favourably consider any proposal for the alteration of the law I should like to know precisely what is the nature of the alteration we are asked to consider. The view of the Government at present is that the law as stated in Section 157 of the Public Health Act is perfectly adequate. It checks abuses, and it gives every reasonable facility for carrying out the object in view. That section states that if the land is not required for the purposes for which it was bought it shall be sold unless the Local Government Board otherwise orders. If it is proposed to alter the law in this particular case I should certainly desire to know with some precision what the proposed alteration is.

MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): I agree with my hon. and learned friend that we ought to know what we are driving at in this matter, and that it would be well if the Amendment assumed a more definite shape. We are, after all, searching for some amendment of the law, or, at least, the practice of the law, and I would wish to make a definite suggestion on the matter. Before I come to that, I may say that I have remarked that the discussion has been mainly confined to the operations of the London County Council, but any alteration of the law will, of course, extend to every county council in the country, and we should bear that in mind. I understand it is common ground as between the Attorney General and my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton that the law as it at present stands gives a council the fullest power to acquire land. That is agreed on, and the only difference is as to retaining land not immediately wanted for the purpose for which it was acquired. As the Attorney General has stated, that depends on Section 157 of the Act of 1875, which gives the Local Government Board discretion in the matter. The Local Government Board, of course, acts on some principle in exercising its discretion, but I think the practice has been that the land should be sold if there is not a speedy prospect of its being employed for the purpose for which it was acquired. The suggestion I would make is that we should introduce into this Bill words to the effect that the Local Government Board, in determining whether land should be sold, should consider the early future as well as the immediate future. If the duty is thrown upon the Local Government Board they can satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the London County Council and other county councils without running the danger of the London County Council, for instance, buying up a whole county. We might give the Local Government Board a lead in the matter by directing that in exercising their discretion they should consider the probable early use as well as the immediate use of the land, and should not order land to be sold because it was not required for a period of five years or thereabouts. I do not want any immediate reply to my suggestion. I merely throw it out for consideration.

MR. CHAPLIN: In reply to my right hon. friend I may say that that is the practice of the Local Government Board now.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): All these cases have to be considered from a practical point of view as well as from a legal point of view. When a local authority desires to acquire land it usually asks the sanction of the Local Government Board to raise a loan, and in giving that sanction the Local Government Board, as a rule, considers the purpose for which the land is to be acquired, as well as the immediate needs of the locality. The consequence is that the tendency in all such cases is to limit the amount of land purchased to what is necessary to meet the immediate requirements of the locality concerned. If Birmingham wishes to buy land in Worcestershire for the purpose of housing its working-class population, and if it wishes to house a thousand people, the Local Government Board would look at the proposal with a view to the amount of land required for the housing of that particular number. It would be infinitely better, however, if Birmingham were able to acquire twenty or thirty, or even fifty acres of land, because then it would be in a position to meet future requirements. But under the existing practice, when future requirements arise Birmingham would be compelled to purchase additional land at an enhanced value, which its previous improvements had produced. If Birmingham had originally purchased a small plot of ten acres, and wished to add another ten acres, it would have to pay an undue price, because of the very money it had previously spent in the locality. The Amendment would avoid that. We wish that the local authorities should be able to purchase land, not only for immediate wants, but also for future wants. There is no danger of speculations in land or anything of that kind. The central authority will always refuse its sanction, and I have known such cases within my own knowledge. If a local authority wishes to purchase an estate of 1,500 acres, unless, possibly, it was the London County Council, power would be refused; but if it wanted to purchase 100 acres in view of the future wants of the community it represents, I think it ought to have the necessary power. There is not the slightest danger in adding the Amendment to the Bill. It will encourage local authorities to proceed in the useful work of housing their poor by municipalities outside their own areas. There would not be the least danger in carrying it out, and it would add to the efficiency of the Act.

MR. STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): The County Council of London has no power whatever to purchase land for future requirements, although it has ample powers to purchase land for present requirements. The real point, however, is to provide for future requirements, more especially in London, though also in some other places. I refer to London because it is the local authority with which I am best acquainted. In London, and no doubt in many other places, a very great deal is lost in dealing with this question through want of prescience, foresight, and provision for the future. Where ten acres only may be needed for immediate pressing requirements it would sometimes be wise to purchase forty or fifty acres. The preparation for the housing of the working classes is quite as important as the actual housing. One of our greatest difficulties in clearing away slums in order to substitute better houses is that the old houses have to be pulled down before the new houses can be built. Under these circumstances a great many of the people are permanently displaced — many of them may be rightly displaced—and they make still greater the pressure of housing elsewhere. If we had the power to look forward in this matter we might in many instances be able to erect the new houses in time to receive the occupants of the slums who would be dispossessed. This is one of the most important features of the whole question. I am not pressing the Government to adopt this Amendment, but I would press them to adopt its principle in some form or other, in order that power should be given to the local authorities to purchase land, not only for the present, but the prospective needs of their localities.

MR. CHANNING: I should like to remind the right hon. Gentleman that we are trying to carry out such recommendations of the Housing of the Working Classes Commission as are advisable, and that, with a view to cheapening land in towns, the Commission went so far as to propose to impose a special tax on all unoccupied land in the neighbourhood of towns in order to increase the inducements to the owner to part with it on reasonable terms. I would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the proposal now before the Committee is more moderate and more conciliatory to the landed interest than the very stringent recommendation of the Commission. The whole object of this Amendment is to forestall the enormous prospective value of land, and to prevent ratepayers in urban communities being compelled to pay needlessly heavy rates in the future.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: With reference to the suggestion of my right hon. friend the Member for Bodmin, my impression is that the power he proposes already exists. If I understand the right hon. Gentleman opposite rightly, he suggests that the powers should be extended to enable municipal councils to acquire land, even though they do not want to build lodging-houses at present. That is a very different matter from the proposal in the Bill. While no one would desire to restrict unduly the power of the local authority to acquire land if there was some reasonable probability that in the near future it would be wanted for the building of lodging-houses, very great care would be needed to see that we do not authorise the local authority to acquire land merely on the ground that at some time or another it might be utilised for this purpose. The whole subject will be carefully considered by the Government between this and the Report stage, and I can assure the right hon. and hon. Members on the other side of the House that while the Government are anxious not to do anything which might lead to what has been called land speculation in acquiring land under these powers with the mere idea that in the future it might come in useful, there is every desire on their part to see that the local authorities should have power which may be beneficial for enabling them to acquire land when it may be secured advantageously for the community, without waiting to the last moment when they are pressed for the immediate use of it.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said that the discretionary powers vested in the London County Council were limited. Before the London County

Council could acquire any land for the purposes of any improvement they had, first of all, to pass a resolution in favour of that improvement. However eligible a piece of land might be for some contemplated improvement, they had no statutory power to purchase that land before the improvement was actually resolved upon. The object of the Amendment involved, in that view, an alteration of the law, which the experience of the London County Council had shown to be extremely desirable. He might say that proposals had been made from time to time for the acquisition of extremely desirable property for municipal improvements, and which could then have been obtained at a low figure; but when the resolution to acquire that property was proposed the price immediately went up. Having regard to that experience, he trusted the Attorney General would receive this Amendment favourably.

CAPTAIN PRETYMAN (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said he did not know anything more calculated to rush up the price of land than that local bodies should be allowed to enter the noble army of land speculators. When anyone bought land cheap it was not with the object of cheapening the price of adjoining land, and if local bodies were to be allowed to acquire land in this distinctly speculative manner, it would be their interest that the adjoining land should go up in value, and not in the direction of cheapening it. He questioned whether it would be in the interest of the ratepayers that their representatives should be allowed to enter the army of land speculators and buy land in this manner in the open market, because they thought that they might want that land at some future time. Land did not always rise, it sometimes fell in value; and it was quite possible, if the land was not wanted for some years, that the prosperous times then existing might rapidly become less prosperous, that the large prospective influx of workmen to the district might never come, that the land might never be required for workmen's houses, and that great loss would fall on the municipality. That was the experience of those who had had to do with the buying and selling of land. The acceptance of the Amendment would not tend at all to cheapen the price of land, but would rather have an opposite effect.

MR. PICKERSGILL said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton proposed as an alternative to his Amendment, to insert after the words, "for supplying," the words, "the present and future needs of their district." He might point out, in answer to the picture of the municipality engaging in land speculation which the Attorney General had drawn before the Committee, that the word "needs" seemed to sufficiently safeguard against their embarking on land speculation. If the Government were prepared to accept the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman he would be very glad to withdraw his Amendment, but failing that, he proposed to take a division.

MR. CRIPPS (Gloucestershire, Stroud) said that the point raised was a very important one, especially in connection with what had been said by the Attorney General. What the hon. and learned Member for South Leeds had said was perfectly accurate—that land could only be taken by municipalities for statutory purposes which could be defined. He thought that that restriction should be preserved; and he did not agree that the proposal suggested by the hon. Member on the other side of the House would at all cheapen the acquisition of land. It would have exactly the opposite effect. If they allowed corporations to join, he would not say land speculators, but other purchasers of land, the value of the land would be enhanced. For, as regarded those plots of land, the very fact of there being a new purchaser in the market would enhance their value. That was not only the case in London, but in other localities. But, on the other hand, land had not always gone up in value; it had sometimes gone down. His experience was that the latter result occurred as often as the former. But the reason why he rose was to say that he hoped the Government, in considering the matter before the Report stage was reached, would not give up what was the true principle in all these cases, which was, not to allow corporate bodies to purchase land at their mere will, but only in respect of statutory duties or obligations thrown upon them. So far as the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton was concerned, if they used the words "present or future needs," they would take away all present safeguards. He was not, at the present moment, considering the question from the ratepayers' point of view; but as a mere matter of business he thought it was a mistake to take away the restriction of the existing law, the absence of which might lead to confusion in land values.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 132; Noes, 204. (Division List No. 154.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bainbridge, Emerson
Baker, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Charles (Glasgow
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carew, James Laurence
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Crombie, John William
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, Arthur
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (South'ton
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Gold, Charles
Gourley, Sir E. Temperley
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, T. Charles H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holden, Sir Angus
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez Edw.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Keswick, William
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Crae, George
M'Ewan, William
M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Maddison, Fred.
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Morris, Samuel
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Malley, William
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Pilkington Sir G. A. (Lancs, SW
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Redmond, William (Clare)
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Runciman, Walter
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarsh.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Spicer, Albert
Steadman, William Charles
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Edward
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Thornton, Percy M.
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.)
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Wilson, H. J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, Jos. H. (Middlesbrough

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Pickersgill and Mr. Fenwick.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Aird, John
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Brist'l)
Beach, Rt Hn W. W. B. (Hants.)
Bethell, Commander
Biddulph Michael
Bill, Charles
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brown Alexander H.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgw
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish V. C. W. (Derby)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. E. T. D.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Curzon, Viscount
Denny, Colonel
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford Sir William Theodore
Drage, Geoffrey
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hn. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man.
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gilliat, John Saunders
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon Sir J. H.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William E. H.
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool)
Lonsdale, Jon Brownlee
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowles, John
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edin. W.)
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milbank, Sir Powlett C. J.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)
Murray, C. J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunket, Rt. Hn. Horace Curz'n
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Cheltenham
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Savory, Sir Joseph
Seely, Charles Hilton
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stanley, Sir Henry M (Lambeth
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, W. E. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Jos. Powell- (Birm.)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

Clause 2:—

*THE CHAIRMAN: The next Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member is unnecessary, because the section which he proposes to make inapplicable is so already by the Act. The Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire might be brought up more conveniently as a new clause.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: Upon a point of order, Sir, I think the Amendment standing in my name should precede that standing in the name of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire. In Clause 2 I propose to leave out "with the consent of the county council," in order to insert the words, "shall on an order being made by the Local Government Board." The object of this Amendment is to bring about some compulsion with regard to the local authority. We had to-day an extraordinarily interesting document issued by the Local Government Board, calling attention to the powers which local authorities had under the Act of 1890, and also under the powers of the Public Health Act, which might well have been issued some time ago. Under those Acts there are large powers vested in the local authorities which, unfortunately, the local authorities seldom avail themselves of, the result being that local authorities do not do their duty with regard to the housing of the people. I believe that state of things will go on until there is some radical alteration in the law, and for that reason I move the Amendment which I have just read. In the opinion of many the county council should be the authority which should compel these bodies to act, and the Bill itself proposes that the county council should supervise the action of the district council in the housing of the poor. But there is one objection to that. In all these matters we require some effective central body to carry out the law. We have now in villages in this country, and in large centres of population many thousands of people housed in houses injurious to the health and the morality of those who inhabit them. I want that altered, and if my Amendment is carried I believe it will be, because it will become the imperative duty of the district councils to inquire into the housing of these people. When I was a member of the Local Government Board certain reports were sent up by our inspectors as to the colliery villages in the north of England which were absolutely heartrending, but the Local Government Board was unable to remedy that state of things, and the local authority unwilling to exercise its powers. I desire, when representations are made, that the Local Government Board should hold an inquiry into the housing of the people in the district complained of, and if they find the condition of things injurious to the health or morals of the people they should have power to issue an order compelling the local authority to enter into a scheme for rehousing the people. Under this Bill, if passed in its present form, there will be the usual process, extending over many months, before any attempt is made to grapple with the evil. In nearly all rural districts the Act is a dead letter, and where it is not it takes many weary months before anything can be done to solve the problem. In one case, before eight cottages could be built, it took two inquiries and nearly two years. That system is one which I do not think will commend itself to the House. Therefore I beg to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out 'with consent of the County Council,' in order to insert, 'Shall on an order being made by the Local Government Board.'" — (*Sir Walter Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): If you put it in that way will not you shut out the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire, which raises a different point?

*THE CHAIRMAN: That raises the same point.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I submit that it raises quite a different point.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may not be aware that the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire has a manuscript Amendment which differs from that put down on the Paper, and which raises exactly the same point.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: But other Members may have Amendments; personally I am against this Amendment, but I shall vote for the other, and if you put the first word "only" it would not shut out that Amendment.

MR. CHAPLIN: The hon. Member commenced his observation by a reference to a circular issued by the Local Government Board which he said might have been advantageously issued some time ago. That being so, why did he not issue it?

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I foresaw that point and expected the right hon. Gentleman to make it, but when the late Liberal Government was in office it was not in my power, and my chief was occupied in changing the whole constitution of the local authorities in rural districts, and was not prepared to do so.

MR. CHAPLIN: I should have said, why did not the Local Government Board do so. But as a matter of fact a similar circular was issued some time ago. I am not precisely aware of the date. The Amendment of the hon. Member, like that which is proposed to be moved by the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire, is not upon the Paper, but I think I understand the object both hon. Members have in view. It is intended to do two things. First it is proposed to make it compulsory for all district councils to enforce the Act whether they desire to or not, and it is proposed to do away with any necessity for the county council. The first question which occurs to me is, who is to enforce it if the district council thinks it undesirable or unnecessary? I am. I am aware of no power by which it could be enforced, except by issue of a mandamus by the Local Government Board. Is that a course which the hon. Gentleman thinks desirable or right? Are we to issue mandamuses against all the district councils in the country for the purpose of compelling them to enforce this Act? It would be interfering with one of the most sacred privileges of self-government, of which the hon. Gentleman is one of the most able exponents, and I further believe it would be impossible. Then, as to the second proposition—that the county council should be dispensed with. There are several good reasons to be advanced for keeping the law as it is; and there were good reasons, when the Working Classes Housing Act was originally debated, for making the county council the governing power of the Act. They must have a better opportunity of acquiring local knowledge and ascertaining the views, wishes, desires, and necessities of the people in a particular district than the Local Government Board, which if it increased its inspectors by an army would be unable to obtain such information. One of the great reasons why the consent of the county council was required on this part of the Act was that the county council at all events would be free from any kind of pressure which might possibly be brought to bear on members of a district council, and I think that such a supposition is only reasonable. I think it would be very undesirable that it should be made compulsory for district councils to enforce this Act, and very undesirable that these local authorities should become the universal landlord of the cottages of the people under these circumstances. Moreover, all incentive in private enterprise would be lost. At the present moment, although many landlords are grievously poor, and are not able to carry out the same amount of improvements, much good has been done even in districts where it is even now very uncertain whether great quantities of land will remain in cultivation or not. We have some experience of this. Take the case of Ireland, where there are numerous powers vested in local authorities for the provision of the people. Notwithstanding all these powers we find, if hon. Members refer to the Report of the Labour Commission, that the accommodation for labourers in Ireland is worse than in either England or Scotland. Nothing is done by private enterprise, the landlords having long given up building cottages, because the control of their property has been taken from them. All these powers which the hon. Gentleman desires to give by his Amendment have been given to the local authorities, and that is the result. I think it is undesirable that these powers should be given to the local authorities, and that being so, I regret that I cannot accept the Amendment.

*MR. CHANNING: As I shall not be in order in bringing my Amendment forward after what you have said, Sir, I should just like to say what the object of that Amendment was. It will be in the recollection of some of those who followed the discussion of the Act of 1890 through the Committee stage upstairs that the right of appeal to the County Council in rural districts by ratepayers and local authorities was expressly given on an Amendment of my own. The appeal was then extended from London to the rural districts. I should argue, by analogy, that it would be desirable to extend the power of appeal to the county council in the present Act in respect to Part 3. Therefore I cannot see my way to support the Amendment of my hon. friend.

*SIR F. S. POWELL (Wigan): I wish to make one or two observations on this, as I think, most dangerous proposal from the other side of the House. My experience has certainly taught me that the occasions are few indeed where any benefit arises from putting the power to enforce the execution of an Act of Parliament in a central authority. The only method of procedure is by mandamus, which is a cumbrous, expensive, and ineffective process. We have had experience of this in dealing with the execution of the Vaccination Act. There are many stories told of persons who have gone to prison, but the result of the action taken has been to show the inefficiency of that method of procedure. I certainly, being anxious for the success of this Bill, do not desire to put into it any provisions which are ineffectual and likely to be attended with harmful results. I think we ought to remember that if there is the ultimate power of mandamus the moral authority of the local council is greater than any other. There is another reason which I have in my mind when I speak of my surprise on hearing this Amendment from the other side. I confess I have more confidence in the local authorities than hon. Gentlemen opposite seem to have. The local authorities were largely constituted by the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton. I myself have faith in the authorities which he created. I do not wish to impair the exercise of their discretion. I do not wish to discourage them from good works. Holding those opinions with regard to the local authorities, I entirely deprecate this proposal, and I hope it will not receive the sanction of the Committee.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): I rather hoped that some compromise would be found in regard to this question, and that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill might have indicated what would have seemed to other Members of the House the groundwork of concession on his part. What I think my hon. friend the Member for Ilkeston means, is that the great weakness of the machinery of the Housing of the Working Classes Act in the rural districts is the want of any real power anywhere to bring pressure to bear upon, and in the last resort to compel, an unwilling rural authority—and there are a great number of slow-moving local authorities—to do their duty in cases where the provision for the housing of the working classes is insufficient. My hon. friend has moved an Amendment which I am bound to say does seem to me to strike rather severely at the ideas of local government which, I think, are held on both sides of the House. I am not saying that the day may not come when the strong interference of a central authority may be necessary, but only a few years have elapsed since any effective machinery was given at all for dealing with those in the rural districts. The rural authorities are young in years. They came into existence in 1894, and a great many duties were imposed upon them for the first time. I am the very first to side with my hon. friend the Member for Ilkeston that there are great and urgent problems in the rural districts as in some of our large towns, but if this Amendment of his were carried I am afraid it would act rather as a discouragement than an encouragement to the local authorities in the matter. I have put down an Amendment to insert after the word "council" some words taken directly from the sixteenth section of the Local Government Act of 1894, which I venture to think was one of the most useful clauses of the great measure we owe to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton. That is a clause under which a county council could, under certain circumstances, set the law in motion against a rural council not doing its duty. The words which describe the preliminary state of things which has to exist before the county council can act are "if satisfied after due inquiry." I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will accept of these words in place of the long proviso in Section 2. Athough the words in the second section may be harmless, my fear is that they will be a great temptation to the county councils to take a narrow and limited view of their duties instead of a wide and general view. I figure to myself a county council going into this matter. Of course there has to be a local inquiry. A county council would not think of issuing an order about the housing of the working classes without sending one of its officials or a committee of its own body to the spot to inquire into the matter. I have also placed on the Paper an Amendment which I think is closely connected with the first one—that is, to introduce the second sub-section of the Local Government Act of 1894, and enact that if a county council is satisfied, after the lapse of a certain period of time, that a rural council either cannot or will not do its duty, it should have the same power which is provided in the sixteenth section of the Local Government Act of 1894, to substitute itself for the local council, and exercise all the powers of the local council in regard to all the matters which are specifically enumerated in the sixteenth section, such as sanitation and the making of roads. My right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton will explain to the House what that clause relates to, and I hope I may be allowed to say, as having had some experience of county council administration, that there is no section in the Local Government Act of 1894 which is working a more gradual improvement in the position of things in the rural districts than the sixteenth section. I wish to apply the principle that underlies that clause to the present state of things. We shall do more by that means than if we try to bring pressure to bear through any great central department in London. My right hon. friend who is in charge of the Bill would find, even with an army of inspectors, a difficulty in examining into affairs and issuing orders in regard to little parishes in remote parts of counties. Therefore, I trust the suggestion I have made will be considered by the right hon. Gentleman. I shall in the next Amendment move the insertion of the words I wish introduced.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not know whether it may save the noble Lord the trouble of moving the Amendment if I state that the Committee is placed in a very peculiar position. I think it is almost unprecedented. We have had one hon. Gentleman opposite moving an Amendment to do away altogether with the consent of the county councils and to allow the rural councils to be untrammelled by any body except the Local Government Board. Another distinguished member of the Front Opposition Bench, however, tells us that he disapproves entirely of the proposal, and that he is going himself to move an Amendment, the effect of which will be to enable the county councils to override the rural district councils. This a most remarkable exhibition of the unanimity which prevails on the Front Opposition Bench, and in these circumstances I feel sure that I shall act far more wisely if I adhere to my own proposal until the members of the Front Opposition Bench are able to make up their mind and submit a proposal they are agreed upon.

Sir WALTER FOSTER: If we are not in complete agreement, at all events we have the virtue of originality in proposing Amendments. The Amendment I propose has scarcely been understood either by the Committee or by the right hon. Gentleman. I do not propose anything like some swooping down on the local authorities unless these authorities should absolutely neglect their duty to their constituencies; and when a local authority does neglect its duty, I think it is high time that we should put in operation some power to compel them to discharge their duty. If they discharge their duties so inefficiently that they add to the miseries of human life, I think some central authority should have the power to compel them to mitigate those miseries. We have only three or four instances in which cottages have been built under the Act since 1890. There was in one case a war going on in the eastern counties for eighteen months with respect to the building of eight cottages. I want to provide a stimulus by legislation which will force the local authorities to do their work. The right hon. Gentleman says my Amendment would interfere with the private efforts of landowners in the way of building cottages for the people. I am glad to say that there are many landowners who look after the housing of the people, and no attempt will be made to interfere with them; but I say that where a scandal has grown up, and the medical officer has made a special report on the subject to his local authority, showing that the condition of the housing of the people is so bad that it is dangerous to the whole community, the ratepayers should have an opportunity of applying not to a local authority, but to the Local Government Board, asking them to remedy the state of affairs. The Local Government Board is not a body that swoops down next day with a mandamus. That Board moves with deliberation and generally with wisdom. The Board, under these circumstances, would immediately communicate with the local authority complained of. They would send down a statement and say that such and such things were complained of as regards the housing of the people. The local authorities would have their attention called to this, and would send back a statement in justification of their position, or they would more likely send back a statement that they were about to take steps. If so, the whole matter would end and the evil would be cured. If they wrote back justifying their position, and stating that there was no occasion for putting the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890 into force, the Local Government Board would say, "The statements sent to us are so and so, and you have not controverted them. You have declined to move, and we must send down an inspector." By inquiry on the spot that inspector would see with his own eyes whether there was any necessity for putting the Act into force, and having done that, he would report to the President of the Local Government Board, who would take the whole matter into consideration, and then only, if the body still remained recalcitrant, would he think of enforcing the law. If they did not carry out the Act he would be able to threaten them with proceedings to compel them to do so. The right hon. Gentleman has shown his courage in connection with the Vaccination Act, and there are matters with respect to the housing of the people where there is as great necessity in the interest of public health and well-being that the law should be enforced. I do not think you would require to proceed by mandamus against any large number of local authorities. I believe the local authorities would rise to the occasion without any recourse to the courts of law. I know from my own personal knowledge that there are hundreds of local authorities doing their duty in this country. There are others that are neglecting the well-being of the localities, and I think we ought to have a stronger power than is possessed at present to compel those bodies, sometimes ignorant and slothful, and sometimes too much afraid of increasing the rates, to do what is necessary for the well-being of the people over whom they rule. As I think my Amendment would shut out some others, and as there is a feeling against the central authority dealing in the way I suggest, I am willing to withdraw the Amendment. I have moved this Amendment not in any spirit of hostility to Local Government, but because I believe such powers in the background would cause local authorities to attend more efficiently to the well-being of the people.

Amendment negatived.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE moved an Amendment providing that the council of any rural district might, with the consent of the county council, "if satisfied after due inquiry," adopt Part 3 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, either for the whole of their district or places therein.

MR. CHAPLIN said the Amendment was unnecessary, because inquiries would be held as a matter of course.

SIR HENRY FOWLER stated that a similar precedent had been followed in the Act of 1894. The Amendment now proposed was one which would strengthen and not weaken the Bill. It would prevent inquiries from being of such a protracted nature as they otherwise would be.

*MR. CHANNING said he understood that one of the objects of the Bill was to shorten the number of stages which would lead up to the consummation they wished —namely, the provision of houses for the working classes. He distinctly objected to his noble friend's Amendment, because it would compel a county council to initiate on every occasion a full local inquiry into all the circumstances, and would thus bring in again the stages of procedure of Section 53, which it was the chief merit of the Bill to combine. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not accept the Amendment.

COMMANDER BETHELL (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): The hon. Member is quite mistaken in thinking the county council will inquire again into the matter if the evidence is brought before them by the persons interested. I think it is much better that it should be left open whether they should inquire by means of their own agents or be satisfied with the evidence brought before them, and I recommend my right hon. friend not to accept the Amendment of the noble Lord.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I think there is some misconception in reference to this inquiry. One of the merits of the Bill at first sight was that the inquiries would disappear, but anyone who reads the second sub-section of this clause must see that the number of particulars to which the county council should have regard are such that hardly any county council will be able to comply with the provision without having an inquiry. By raising all these points in Sub-section 2 we suggest difficulties which will cause delay and have the same effect as the clause in the old Act. Under the words proposed by the noble Lord there would not be a necessity for an inquiry in every case. The county council, as a rule, is a body of very good business men, and in a case where the matter was so simple that the whole thing could be done in an hour's conversation, that would be all the inquiry necessary. In some cases a visit by one of the members of the county council would be all the inquiry necessary. In all simple cases the inquiry would be a very brief matter, and in every difficult case, whether you put it in the Bill or not, there will have to be an inquiry before the council gives its consent. I therefore do not think the words proposed by my noble friend are likely to have the effect of increasing the number of inquiries.

MR. HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): My hon. friend now admits that the county councils are bodies of very good business men as a rule, and that admission fully justifies the action of the Committee in rejecting the Amendment he moved just now. In regard to the Amendment of the noble Lord, it seems to me, on the whole, to be undesirable to insert the words. There is no doubt that in most cases a prudent county council would have a local inquiry before it gave its sanction to any big scheme, and that local inquiry would, as a rule, be conducted without delay, without any serious amount of cost, and probably to the perfect satisfaction of the inhabitants of the locality. But there might be cases in which the facts were so well brought before the county council by its committee or by members of its own body that a local inquiry would be unnecessary. These words, I think, would unduly fetter the discretion of the county council. The question whether Sub-section 2 should be omitted may be a question for subsequent consideration. That subsection, in the view of the Government, I understand, merely indicates certain points upon which the county council must be satisfied, and I think, if looked at in that light, it will cease to be so objectionable to some hon. Members opposite. It may very likely admit of amendment, but it is far better that we should not on the present Amendment discuss whether or not Sub-section 2 shall stand. In view of the great division of opinion on the matter and in view of the fact that the hands of the county council may possibly be fettered by this proposal, I would suggest to my noble friend that he should withdraw the Amendment.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I should like to add a word to the appeal to the noble Lord not to press this Amendment. My experience of county council work is that it is very undesirable to impose upon that body any work which it is not absolutely necessary it should undertake. Many of the members are men of not very ample means, and with long distances to travel. Anything which imposes unnecessary burdens upon them will incline them rather to get rid of the burdens altogether, and in such a matter as this to reject the proposals at once rather than hold an inquiry.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: My hope in moving to insert these words at this particular point was that the right hon. Gentleman might be inclined to withdraw the second sub-section. The Bill, as brought in, no doubt to a certain extent removed the formality and waste of time which now hangs around the action of the county council; but the second subsection reserves so much of it that I was naturally anxious to get rid of that portion of the measure, and as an inducement to the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw the second sub-section I offered these words, leaving the county council the power and the right and the duty of holding some inquiry of however informal a character. I quite agree with the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire that the real point of difference is the second sub-section, and if the Committee prefer to take the division on the question of the omission of that sub-section, I am perfectly willing to withdraw my Amendment, as the right hon. Gentleman has not met me in the spirit in which I had hoped he would do.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The first Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire has already been disposed of by a decision arrived at by the Committee.

MR. CHANNING: On a question of order, Sir. The Amendment of which I have given notice may have given an impression different from that which I wished. Will it now be in order for me to move the Amendment as printed on the Paper, with the insertion of the words "on the representation of" for the words "or any"? If it would be in order, I should like to move that.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The point disposed of by the Committee is this: the alternative offered to the Committee was whether the county council or the Local Government Board should be the authority to decide. The Amendment of the hon. Member is to the effect that the mandate should be referred to the Local Government Board, which is thereupon to hold a local inquiry, and after considering the report of such inquiry, to make the Order. The Committee have negatived the proposal that the Local Government Board should make the Order, and have left the decision with the county council. This Amendment, therefore, appears to raise—though not in precisely the same terms—a question which has been already disposed of.

MR. CHANNING: With all respect, may I say that the question I put is whether the Amendment standing on the Paper as printed would be admissible.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment standing on the Paper is also to the same effect—

> "Thereupon the Local Government Board may hold a local inquiry, and, after considering the report of such inquiry, may either issue or withhold a certificate."

That would still leave the decision to the Local Government Board, a proposition which has already been negatived by the Committee. The next Amendment is a repealing Amendment, which ought to come with the repealing section—namely, Section 3. The next Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire ought to be raised as a new clause.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I beg to move the omission of Sub-section 2. I do so with a view to facilitating progress under this Bill when it becomes an Act of Parliament. If we put on the face of this Bill all these conditions suggesting subjects of inquiry by the county council, we should raise difficulties which otherwise might be avoided. We should trust the county council to look into these matters without having them put on the face of the Bill. Under the old Act, when we tried to push the local authorities into action with regard to the housing of the poor, we had all these difficulties in the clause then, and every one of them was a suggestion for delay and obstruction. If we put them on the face of this Bill again we shall have similar obstructions raised against putting the Act into force, and therefore I beg to move the omission of Sub-section 2.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 14, to leave out Sub-section 2."—(*Sir Walter Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section 2 stand part of the clause."

MR. CHAPLIN: The hon. Member objects to the retention of these words because, he says, the effect of them will be to suggest a number of difficulties which in the future will cause delay in the same way as delay has been caused in the past. He says that this sub-section raises all the old points which caused difficulties in connection with the old Act. No, Sir, it was not these old points which caused the difficulties or delay; it was the cumbrous machinery by which these points when they were raised were decided, and were obliged to be decided, by the county council. In the Bill as it now stands I have removed all that cumbrous machinery, and there would be no necessity, in my mind, for any long period of delay in settling any one of these points. I believe there is a general agreement between the two front benches—and I should hope between the majority of Members on both sides of the House—that the three points here specified are all matters which ought to be considered by the county council. One is the necessity for action on the part of the rural council in regard to the erection of houses; another is the probability of houses being erected in the district by other means; and the third point is the question of whether or not it is prudent, having regard to the rates, for the district council to take such action. Surely these are three points which not only ought to be considered by the county council, but which might be considered and dealt with without any great delay or difficulty. The hon. Member must remember that on the county council there are one or more representatives of each district in the area who will possess local knowledge, and sometimes, no doubt, will be able to satisfy the other members of the council on these points without any formal inquiry whatever. Where that is not the case the county council can hold an inquiry of any kind they may think fit and appropriate, and I cannot see that there is the slightest danger or apprehension of the result the hon. Member fears. I honestly confess I prefer the Bill in its present form; I do not believe such delays will arise; and I do not think the hon. Member has given the real reason why the Act hitherto has failed to so large an extent in country disticts. I think the real reason more use has not been made of the Act is that the rural councils themselves have not been anxious to put the Act into operation.

MR. LAWSON WALTON: I gather that the intention of the right hon. Gentleman is that the county council should have the widest and most unfettered discretion in taking into consideration every topic which bears on the question before them. But the result of specifying in this sub-section certain topics which they are to consider operates as a very considerable restriction of the area in which their discretion must operate. They must no doubt consider all these topics, but any court of law construing this section would hold that their consideration must be confined to these topics. There is apparently no power to take into their cognisance any matter which is not specified either explicitly or implicitly by the language of this section, and therefore what is intended to be an entirely unrestricted consideration will in practical operation be restricted to a consideration of these three points.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): In supporting this Amendment I wish to call the President's attention to Sub-section (c), which reads—

> "To the probability of such accommodation being provided without the adoption of the said part."

What frequently happens at such an inquiry is that the possibility of an increase of the rates being involved leads large property owners to send their agents to give evidence against the proposal to adopt the Act. The agent gives evidence and goes on to show to his own satisfaction that ample provision will be made by private enterprise. The inspector listens to this, as he is bound to do——

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: It is not a Local Government Board inquiry.

MR. BROADHURST: No; but the principle is the same.

MR. CHAPLIN: To what inspector are you referring?

MR. BROADHURST: I am speaking of a case which came under my own personal experience in regard to a Local Government Board inspector, and an application for a loan to build houses by a local authority. It is exactly the same principle, and it will work out in the same way. The agent assures the inquiring authority that private enterprise will provide the necessary accommodation, the inquiring authority is satisfied with the assurance, and the application is refused. But the person giving this evidence is under no obligation to redeem what appeared to be like a promise to provide the accommodation, and the result is that the people are left in precisely the same position as before.

MR. STUART: A very important point has been raised, which I think requires some explanation from the Attorney General. It is quite clear from the words of the President of the Local Government Board that it is desired to give the widest powers of inquiry to the county council, and if possible to encourage that body to inquire into matters, and more particularly those which are specified, but as the hon. and learned Member has pointed out, as the clause is worded, the subjects mentioned become the exclusive subjects of inquiry. Before the clause is put it seems to me that in line 15, after the word "shall," there should be inserted the words "among other considerations."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I do not think these words are at all exclusive. Because it says the council should have regard to the things there specified, it does not follow they should regard those only. The very general nature of the considerations is sufficient to show that the danger apprehended is not a real one, and I do not think the words suggested are necessary.

Question put.

The Committee divided—Ayes, 165; Noes, 105. (Division List No. 155.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B (Hants.
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Courtney, Rt. Hn. Leonard H.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Drage, Geoffrey
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George
Hamond, Sir Chas. (Newcastle
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Alexander
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampste'd
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jenkins, Sir John Jones
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir D. (Swansea)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Mon'mthsh
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Gra'm (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir Thos. (Hartlepl.
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Savory, Sir Joseph
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch
Stanley, Sir Henry M (Lambeth
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sutherland, Sir Thomas
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, W. E. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Usborne, Thomas
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, B. C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Baker, Sir John
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James

Cameron, Sir Chas. (Glasgow)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harrington, Timothy
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Holden, Sir Angus
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John G. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Crae, George
Maddison, Fred.
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Montrose)
Morris, Samuel
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Malley, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Steadman, William Charles
Strachey, Edward
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Wason, Eugene
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Walter Foster and Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The Amendment I now have to move—and having already stated the case I shall not take up the time of the Committee—is to insert at the end of this clause words which are modelled on Section 2 of the Local Government Act to enable the county council to be substituted for the rural district council. I beg to move.

MR. CHAPLIN: This Amendment, of course, is not on the Paper, and, as far as I can gather from hearing it read, it is that when the county council becomes aware of the fact that the rural district council has not performed its duty, it may, by passing a resolution, take over all the powers of the rural council to itself, and do the work which ought to have been done by the rural district council. In the first place, I do not know how this knowledge is to be in the possession of the county council, or by what means they are to arrive at it. There is no provision in the Bill enabling them to make inquiries as to whether or not the rural district council do their duty, and, under all the circumstances, I am not prepared to agree to this new departure without having any time to consider it.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: May I point out to the right hon. Gentleman that this is not a new departure? This is a clause which was, I believe, very thoroughly considered and put into the Act of 1894. It was seen that there was a danger, and everybody knows there is a danger of certain rural authorities being—to use the mildest word—indisposed to discharge the duties which in the public interest ought to be performed. In the Act of 1894 there was a provision inserted that upon representations being made that the district council would not attend to such matters as sewage, water, and so on, the county council should have the right—not the compulsion—to interfere.

MR. CHAPLIN: On whose representations?

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: The parish council. I quite appreciate the difficulty of assenting to an Amendment which has not been on the Paper, but what I would press the right hon. Gentleman to do is to promise that this question shall be considered before the Report stage. The right hon. Gentleman has pointed out one defect. The representation will have to be made by somebody, or some body of ratepayers, or some body of men. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider this matter of supplying an alternative when a local duty is neglected by the local authority. I have had, and still have, the greatest confidence in the county councils. I think they discharge their duties in a very admirable manner, and in my opinion they are just the authority to perform this duty if it is neglected by the local authority. I do not want to labour the point, but I would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to consider the precedent deliberately adopted by the House of Commons and by Parliament in 1894 under precisely similar circumstances to meet a precisely similar difficulty.

MR. CHAPLIN: I should at all times consider anything coming from the right hon. Gentleman, especially on questions of this sort, as the right hon. Gentleman was the author of the difficult and complicated Act of 1894, which he piloted with such remarkable success through the House. The Amendment rather took me by surprise, because all the Amendments which had appeared on the Paper were Amendments for the purpose of abolishing and getting rid of the interference of the county council altogether. But now we have a totally different proposal. It is suggested that under certain circumstances the county council should be put into a position of greater power in regard to the rural district councils, that they should be able to take over the duties which the rural district council had failed to discharge, and, I suppose, to charge the rates of the district for the purpose, although I do not understand that that is in the Amendment. Of course I will consider the matter carefully before the Report stage. I cannot make any definite answer with regard to it now, as there are several important points which will have to be taken into consideration. There is the question as to by whom the representations should be made. The representation of the parish council is one thing, but the representation of only twenty ratepayers is another. Then there is the question of the charges which will have to be borne, and so on. In any case I content myself with saying this: I readily accede to the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman that before the Report stage we will consider this question.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The only reason this Amendment appeared on the Paper was that there had been a misunderstanding. I understood that an hon. friend of mine had placed a similar proposal on the Paper, and I did not desire to appear to forestall his right to bring the matter forward. I was not aware that the Amendment was not on the Paper until I studied the Amendments which reached me this morning. This proposal is one which I have very often advocated both in the press and on the platform; but I quite think—both because it is a very important matter and one upon which we should greatly value any concession the right hon. Gentleman would make, and also because, through an inadvertence, the Amendment did not appear on the Paper—that in view of the very courteous and considerate manner in which the right hon. Gentleman has met me in the matter, I should ask leave to withdraw the Amendment. I should, however, like to say that the question of the persons from whom the representations should come has been considered. It is quite true that in Section 16 of the Local Government Act that right is limited to the parish council, but what I wish to remind the Committee of is that you may have an obstructive rural council and you may also have an obstructive parish council. What is very much desired is that there should be the right for a certain number of persons to approach the county council, so that they should not be in the power of the parish council. I know a particular case where a parish council have actually stood in the way of an application being made for a good water supply in their parish, although certainly one-half of the inhabitants most ardently desire it. I trust this aspect of the question will not be lost sight of, because if the power is limited to the parish council you go only half the road towards reform. Naturally, I should very much prefer to have the Amendment limited to the parish council than not have it at all, but I cannot help thinking that any limitation to the parish council in all these matters is rather a misfortune, because there are cases in which the parish councils have not yet risen to the heights of wisdom and reforming energy to which, no doubt, in course of time they will rise.

MR. HOBHOUSE: I hope my right hon. friend will give the most careful and favourable consideration to this question, because I think he will thereby make this clause of the Bill much more useful. It is not that in many cases the county council would actually put the power into operation; the great value of the power is mainly that the county council has it *in terrorem*, and may use it in the last resort. The knowledge of the existence of such a weapon as this very often brings to reason a rural council which does not wish to carry out the law. I wish to remind the right hon. Gentleman that this is not a new matter. There is a similar provision already applied to three most important classes of local government administration. The question of sewage, the question of water, and the question of roads are all subject to a similar provision, and we shall not be going very much further if we bring the housing of the working classes into line with those matters.

MR. LOUGH: As the Amendment is to be withdrawn I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I hope the right hon. Gentleman will take counsel with the hon. Member for South Tyrone as to the principle involved in this Amendment. We have had a great experiment in Ireland with regard to the building of workmen's houses, and I think the hon. Member will agree with me in saying there were hundreds of districts, or at any rate scores, in which nothing whatever was done until compulsion from some outside authority was brought to bear on the defaulting councils. I do not know whether it would not be better, if we could trust them to exercise their discretion, that the Local Government Board should be the authority to compel the defaulting councils to do their duty. At any rate, the right hon. Gentleman may be convinced of this: that the cause of the defect in the carrying out of this law is that the councils are reluctant to do their duty, and our efforts in regard to this Bill will be completely thrown away if some effective clause is not moved on the Report stage by which some authority will be enabled to compel these bodies to do what they are now reluctant to do.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR WALTER FOSTER said that Section 53 limited the amount of land attached to these cottages to half an acre. That amount of land was in some cases too small. In many rural districts they would not only confer a benefit on the population, but would make the housing of the working classes easier by giving an acre of land to each cottage. Cottages with such an allotment attached would attract men from the towns, and the extra amount of land in possession of the local authority would provide for more housing as the need arose, and the limit was reduced to half an acre. Moreover, a cottage with an acre of ground could be let to pay the local authority more in proportion. It would be a popular improvement in the Act, and he begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after '1890,' to insert the words 'in Section 53 the word "half."'"—(*Sir Walter Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHAPLIN: This raises one of those questions which in the past have been the subject of complete discussion in this House, and I am loth to depart from the existing arrangement, which has been settled after such a long discussion within my own recollection and within a very few years. I quite agree that nothing is more desirable than that there should be a good garden in connection with every cottage, and to ensure that I will do as much as any person in this House. My own experience undoubtedly leads me to the conclusion that for the use of the owner of a cottage and his family half an acre of land is amply sufficient. If you provide more than half an acre, a man and his family cannot deal with it themselves, and they have to call in paid labour for the purpose, it really is no use and no benefit to them. If you want more than half an acre it becomes more than a garden, for it becomes an allotment, and there is every provision under the sun at the present moment for the provision of allotments and small holdings in the country. I am convinced myself that it would be a mistake to depart from the existing law, because half an acre is the best a man can have, and you do not do him any kindness by making it into an acre, for then he must employ labour to keep it going. Under these circumstances, I think I must adhere to the present arrangement.

*MR. CHANNING: The Amendment of my hon. friend the Member for Ilkeston refers to the whole scope of section 53 of the Act of 1890, but the right hon. Gentleman is aware that that section refers both to the urban and the rural districts. I should like to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman would not be prepared to accept the Amendment of my hon. friend if it were confined in its operation to purely rural districts. It might be desirable to enlarge the land which is to be used for the purpose of a garden in rural districts, although it might be unreasonable to enlarge those gardens in the immediate vicinity of large towns. In such a case it might be an unreasonable proposal, but where this Bill operates in purely rural districts I confess that I think the case of my hon. friend is unanswerable, and I do not see why there should not be this opportunity given to the local authorities to charge the rates for the purpose of providing one acre of land, although myself I should prefer two acres, in the rural districts. If my hon. friend would move his Amendment in that form it would be entirely free from any objection. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is prepared to accept this Amendment if it is restricted to rural districts.

MR. CHAPLIN: I do not think so.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN agreed that it would be more valuable to provide an acre than half an acre. Of course, in the country the produce could only be used by the family themselves, but surely they could trust the rural authorities to say in their own neighbourhood what was a right and reasonable quantity of land which a man should have. Circumstances varied, and his belief was that half an acre for a mere garden was rather large; on the other hand, he could conceive circumstances under which half an acre would be too small.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I should just like to put this point to the right hon. Gentleman. In districts where the district councils understand the wants of the people they will be able, under this Amendment, to give a small plot of land which may not be more than a quarter of an acre, and if they see the necessity of giving a larger quantity of land they can do so. At all events you would be making the chance of the local authority getting its money back for the undertaking all the better by providing an acre of land, because the rent would be proportionately higher, because the occupiers of the cottages will be able to make money out of the land by cultivation, which would add to the prosperity of the local council as well as to the prosperity of the people occupying those cottages. This Amendment does not force an acre of land on everybody, but it simply gives the local authorities the power of adding an acre in cases where they think it is necessary. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will reconsider this question, and see if he can give us this little extension of the quantity of land for cottages in rural districts.

MR. CHAPLIN: My hon. friend must bear in mind that if these people want an acre they can get it as an allotment. There are gardens, allotments, and small holdings, and they are very well known under those three separate heads. Therefore, the inhabitants of cottages have every facility for getting what they want. I think the proposal of the hon. Member would throw difficulties in the way of the provision of cottages in rural districts, and it is a provision which is quite unnecessary. As the object of this Bill is to promote the erection of cottages, I am sure it will be more advantageous to stick to half an acre instead of making it an acre.

MR. BROADHURST: But the Amendment does not propose to make an acre compulsory.

MR. CHAPLIN: I know that.

MR. BROADHURST: The Amendment allows it to be a quarter of an acre if it is deemed sufficient. Where it would be to the advantage of the cottagers to have an acre they would be able to get it by this Amendment. I cannot see why the right hon. Gentleman wishes to tie the hands of the local authorities. I do think that the right hon. Gentleman has entirely misunderstood this Amendment, and when he has had his attention called to the flexibility of this proposal I think that, on reconsideration, he will accept it. I do not like compulsory legislation myself, for I like local authorities to have freedom of action in these matters, and they should not be left without any option.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 80; Noes, 130. (Division List No. 156.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Asher, Alexander
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Baker, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Chas. (Glasgow)
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harrington, Timothy
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Maddison, Fred.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morris, Samuel
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Jas. F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Malley, William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Steadman, William Charles
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Ure, Alexander
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Walter Foster and Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice.

NOES.

Allsopp, Hon. George
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, E.)
Chamberlain J. A. (Worc'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Donkin, Richard Sim
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Drage, Geoffrey
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Garfit, William
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord Geo.
Hamond, Sir C. (Newcastle)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence
Heaton, John Henniker
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howarth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawson John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn (Swans'a
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Liverp'l
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh.)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pender, Sir James
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs, Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. Horace C.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlepool)
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux

Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Usborne, Thomas
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, J. Powell (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Younger, William

Tellers for the Noes—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

*Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I rise to propose an Amendment which I regret is not on the Paper. It is to omit the word "special" in line 26. The word "special" refers to what is called the special expenses rate, and the effect of the words as they stand would be to take the expenses of the Act off the special expenses rate, and levy them on the general expenses rate. There is a very great difference between the two. I believe the Local Government Board has power under the Act of 1875 to declare these expenses to be special expenses, but I see no reason why by these words we should transfer the expenses from the special to the general rate in order that the Local Government Board may exercise its power of transferring them back. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will accept the Amendment, and that the expenses will be divided as they always have been divided.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 26 to leave out the word 'special.'"—(*Mr. Grant Lawson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'special' stand part of the clause."

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would rather wish that the Amendment had been on the Paper, because then I would have been able to give my hon. friend a more complete answer than I can at the present moment. I am not quite certain what the effect would be of omitting these words, because several clauses in two or three Acts of Parliament are concerned. We have no intention of putting any new burden whatever on the local authorities, but my own impression is that the Amendment has reference to a state of things which will not exist when this Bill comes into operation. If my hon. friend will postpone the matter I will consider it.

Mr. GRANT LAWSON: I think I ought to be satisfied with what my right hon. friend has said. I will withdraw the Amendment and bring it up again on Report.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—

Mr. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I hope the right hon. Gentleman will have no objection to extending the benefits of this Bill to Ireland. We have already in Ireland legislation for providing labourers' cottages, but it does not apply to cities and towns. I hope, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman will consent to accept my Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, to leave out the words 'or Ireland.'"—(*Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. CHAPLIN: I hope the hon. Gentleman will not press his Amendment. My impression is—although, of course, I do not speak with authority—that this extension of the Bill is really not needed in Ireland. I believe there is hardly a town in Ireland where congestion of the population can be said to exist, and in the country districts there are already Acts of Parliament for providing cottages for labourers. The Amendment would considerably alter the Bill and its machinery, and having had no application of any sort or kind, except the hon. Member's Amendment, I cannot see that there is any demand for the Bill in Ireland.

Mr. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: I put the Amendment down at the request of my constituents in Cork, which is one of the places where the Bill is very much needed. I feel I must press it to a division.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 157.)

AYES.

Allsopp, Hon. George
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Bartley, George C. T.
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worcs.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Denny, Colonel
Donkin, Richard Sim
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Drage, Geoffrey
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Garfit, William
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.
Hamond, Sir C. (Newcastle)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Hardy, Laurence
Heaton, John Henniker
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lafone, Alfred
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swnsea
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Liverpool
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'gh, W
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
More, Rbt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pender, Sir James
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs. Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. Horace C.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l)
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Usborne, Thomas
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Williams, Joseph Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Younger, William
TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harrington, Timothy
Hazell, Walter
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Chas. H.
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Crae, George
Maddison, Fred
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthn)
Morris, Samuel
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Malley, William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Steadman, William Charles
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Ure, Alexander
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Yoxall, James Henry
TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Clause 3 agreed to.

MR. CHAPLIN: The clause which stands in my name proposes to give to the new Metropolitan Borough Councils the same borrowing powers under Part 3 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, as they will possess under Part 2 of that Act. It appears to me desirable that this power thould be conferred by legislation, and that all difficulties and delays in adopting schemes should be removed.

New clause—

"1. Any expenses incurred by the Council of a metropolitan borough under Part 3 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, whether within or without the borough, shall be defrayed as part of the ordinary expenses of the Council, and in that Act the expressions 'district,' 'local authority,' and 'local rate' shall for the purposes of Part 3 of the Act include a metropolitan borough, the Council of the borough, and the general rate of the borough.

"2. Where the Council of a metropolitan borough adopt Part 3 of the said Act the power of the Council to borrow for the purposes of that part shall be exerciseable in the like manner and subject to the like conditions as the power of the Council to borrow for the purposes of Part 2 of that Act."—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

—brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

*MR. HAZELL (Leicester) said as the first Amendment standing in his name had been dealt with, he need not move it, but he proposed now to move to insert a new clause to extend the time fixed for repayment of loans by local authorities. He did not agree with the proposition that the land purchased should be held as a permanent asset, because it was not given to man to see into the dim and distant future, even as regards the value of land in great towns—but 100 years was a moderate time in which to pay for the land, and a sinking fund of three shillings and fourpence annually invested at 3 per cent. with compound interest would pay off £100 at the end of a century. As to the buildings, though they might last for two hundred years or more, he proposed to extend the repayments to only seventy years, because it was not impossible that in the future the working classes would be living in buildings of a very different character to the barracks which were at present being erected. He hoped that the Government would see its way to accept his Amendment, which was a reasonable one.

New clause—

"Section 66 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, shall be qualified by the following proviso added at the end of the section, namely:—Provided that loans raised by local authorities for the purposes of this part of this Act shall be exempt from the provisions as to period of repayment contained in Subsection 4 of Section 234 of the Public Health Act, 1875, and instead thereof the period of repayment of such loans shall be—(1) not exceeding 100 years for that part of the loan required for the purchase of land; and (2) not exceeding seventy years for that part of the land required for the erection of buildings."—(*Mr. Hazell.*)

—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHAPLIN: I stated on the Second Reading of the Bill, in considerable detail, my objection to any extension of the period for repayment of loans for the buildings, and I thought then, and have the presumption to think now, that the arguments which I advanced on that occasion were arguments of weight which at least required some reply. The hon. Gentleman has made no attempt to reply to them, or remove the objections which I stated and then felt with regard to this proposal. Moreover his proposal with regard to the buildings is that the term of repayment should only be extended from sixty to seventy years. I had several calculations made as to what would be the effect of an extension, but I must admit I never took the term of seventy years. I never considered if an alteration had been made that it would be made from sixty to seventy years.

*MR. HAZELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman consent to a longer period? If so, I shall be delighted.

MR. CHAPLIN: And the relief which would be derived from such an extension would be so small as to be of no use whatever. I am sorry therefore that I cannot entertain it at all. With regard to the extension of the time for the repayment of loans borrowed for the purchase of land, I have always admitted that that to a certain extent stands on a different footing. Whether I agree to any concession on the point or not, I think it is clear that the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman does not provide any fitting opportunity on which to make a concession of that kind, and I make no promise whatever in regard to what I may be induced to do in the future. I say this because, if such an Amendment is accepted, it ought to apply in all cases, and this Amendment would exclude some local authorities from any benefit. Under the circumstances, I have no alternative but to decline to accept the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. STEADMAN: I should like to ask your ruling, Sir, as to whether my new clause, page 26 on the Paper, would be in order?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is unusual to determine future questions in the middle of a discussion; but if it is any satisfaction to the hon. Member to know, I may say that when it is reached I propose to rule it out of order.

MR. STEADMAN said had his Amendment been in order he would not have detained the Committee by speaking on that then before them. As, however, it apparently would not be in order, he would like to say a few words in support of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Leicester. It did not go so far as he could have wished, but at the same time it contained a principle which was in his opinion of the most vital importance. He drew attention to the fact that the district council of Sevenoaks applied to the Local Government Board for powers to build, and that the Local Government Board fixed the term for the repayment of the loan at forty-two years. As the result of the calculations made, the district council found that the total cost of the acquisition of the land and the building of thirty-four six-roomed cottages upon it would be £10,000, and that if they charged a rental of 9s. a week the result would be a loss to the ratepayers of the district. Nine shillings a week was a very high rental for a working-man, twenty miles out of London, and the district council had no option but to abandon their scheme. Had the time for repayment been extended to another twelve years, the cottages could have been built and let at a less rental without loss to the ratepayers. The London County Council were going at the present time to build cottages at Tooting, and would have to charge a rental of 7s. 6d. a week for two-roomed cottages, and there was not a working-man at the present time who could afford out of his wages to pay such a rental. Having regard to the sympathetic attitude of the right hon. Gentleman, he had had hopes that he would have made one or two small concessions in this direction, especially having regard to the fact that, having been approached by the London County Council, he was conversant with their views, which were in favour of the extension of the term from sixty to 100 years. If the Government had been in earnest in their attempt to grapple with this problem, they would have approached it in a statesmanlike manner, instead of bringing in a paltry Bill of two clauses, from which all Amendments of a practical character were shut out. The "sacred rights of property" would have to be attacked before the solution was found.

MR. STUART: The right hon. Gentleman has pointed out that, even if this Amendment were accepted, the gain to the tenant would not be very large, but the connection in which the argument in its favour was used was not in regard to any question of the length of the period for which local authorities would be allowed to borrow, on which the reduction of the cost of the building scheme was to be reckoned, but that the real method of reducing the cost of the building scheme to the municipality and of reducing the rents to the tenants was to be found in a much more drastic dealing with Parts 1 and 2 of the Act. And here I merely reiterate the argument used by my hon. friend behind me that this present Bill does not afford us any adequate means of reducing the rents which are charged to the tenants under this scheme. The facts are that if we were to extend the period of borrowing to one hundred years on the land and on the building we should not make a very great reduction, although it would be a substantial one, in the tenant's rent. If you take the Boundary Street area and Millbank, and reckon the cost on the rebuilding scheme, upon which the interest is in one instance three per cent., and in the other two and three-quarters on periods of fifty years and fifty-eight years respectively—if those periods were extended to one hundred years, I find that for a house of three rooms for which we have at present to charge 9s. a week, which is a terrible rent to have to charge——

MR. CHAPLIN: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Gentleman. Boundary Street was one, what was the other?

MR. STUART: The Millbank scheme. The extension of the period to 100 years from fifty three, in regard to the Boundary Street scheme, would have reduced the rents of these houses—9s. a week—by 7½d., which is a substantial reduction. I want to see it reduced by that amount. But it is not in that direction that we look for any reduction of rents to any large extent in London. If the period were extended to seventy years, as proposed, the reduction on the rental of 9s. a week would be 3d.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The right hon. Gentleman's Bill does not extend to London.

MR. STUART: Of that I am aware, but I am pretty much in the lists as regards London, and I have put down a clause which would bring London under the Bill, and therefore I am treating these Amendments as if London were within the scope of the Bill. I would like the House to remember what the elements of rent in London are. Every 20s. of rent we take in the Boundary Street area consists of two equal portions; one half is for outgoings and the general maintenance and insurance of the buildings, and the other half is allocated to interest and the sinking fund, so that out of every 20s. 2s. goes to the sinking fund. Therefore it is only 10 per cent. of the whole rental which is affected by the sinking fund at all. Now, I have been extremely anxious that we should not try to draw too big conclusions and anticipate too great results. I want to reduce this Amendment to its just proportions, although I support it; and the figures I have given to the House were given for the purpose of pointing out that this Amendment is not altogether for the purpose of keeping down the rents. I have placed before the Committee perfectly clearly, I hope, what are the limits of the Amendment before us. Although at the most, even if the sinking fund were carried on for 100 years, it would not reduce the rental of a 9s. house more than by about 7½d. a week, yet I say that from my point of view that is well worth doing, and I sincerely hope that the right hon. Gentleman will see his way to make this concession. I feel that there is something in what my right hon. friend says in regard to not extending the period of the sinking fund for buildings to so long as one hundred years, because the nature of the houses required may change before that time, but I think it may be distinctly extended beyond the sixty years at present allowed. In undertakings of a similar kind with which in a private capacity I have to do I would put the period of the sinking fund required for such houses at a longer period than sixty years. The period might well be extended to seventy years. I think that might be taken as a reasonable compromise in the matter. As to land, I do not see any particular reason for limiting that to one hundred years at all. Land might always be regarded as an asset if it was valued as land applicable to workmen's houses. I think it might be regarded as a perpetual asset. Any private firm in building houses for their own employees, as many members of this House have done, would be perfectly justified by the auditors in valuing the land as applicable to the purpose to which it was devoted, and as an asset which did not require writing down. I would suggest that we might adopt the plan of writing down the value of the land—the right hon. Gentleman perfectly understands what I mean—as a perpetual asset which did not want depreciation or sinking fund. I know that in many private instances as regards buildings the period is considerably beyond sixty years. The Amendment proposed by my hon. friend is reasonable, and may be regarded as a reasonable compromise between the larger proposals and the present position of things.

MR. LOWLES (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I entirely disagree with those who describe this as an insignificant and incomplete measure. The effect in the constituency I have the honour to represent of giving the local authority power to go outside their own area would be to induce them to acquire land out of London to build houses at, I believe, such an expenditure as would enable them to let four and five room houses at 5s. or 6s. a week. The railway company convey workmen at the ridiculously small sum of 2d. per day. At Shoreditch the demand for warehouses is increasing every day, and if the occupiers of the small houses removed from the congested centres to the suburbs a much larger sum would come into the coffers of the local authority in the way of rates for warehouses which would be built there. I am thoroughly in favour of the principle underlying this Amendment and the extension of the period of repayment. My hon. friend and myself had a conference with the local authority, and one of the points we were asked to urge if possible was the extension of the period of repayment.

SIR F. S. POWELL: I have had considerable experience in matters of this kind, and I believe it is impossible to lay down a figure which will be strictly and scientifically accurate with respect to the repayment of loans. We ought to have some regard to leading principles. We must cast our eyes beyond London, and look at the country, and most certainly it is not safe with reference to the provinces to say that any given piece of land will keep its value one hundred years. On the contrary, I know from my own experience in the mining districts in Yorkshire, that when the mineral wealth passes away the value of the land immediately diminishes, and therefore any calculation made on the basis of the value of such properties when the mines were in full operation would prove wholly inaccurate when the minerals ceased to exist. I think the same remark applies to property in other districts. Mineral wealth is not the only wealth that becomes exhausted, and I am perfectly sure if you value purely landed property at the rate existing when a community is prosperous, you will find the calculation extremely wrong at the end of a number of years when that prosperity has ceased, or when the industry has changed into a new district. As regards the time during which the value may prevail in the matter of buildings, two conditions have to be satisfied. First of all, the buildings must be well planned and suited to the wants of the people. If they are not so planned and so adapted they will become out of fashion and difficult to let, and the value will depreciate. The other consideration is the character of the building as a structure. We know that if a building is constructed of sound materials, put together by skilful workmen, and of such a character as may suit a severe climate, it may be expected to last many years; but if, on the contrary, your building is frail, and if the weather begins to operate upon it, of course, in a few years it has almost ceased to exist, and has become almost a heap of ruins. The authorities who deal with this matter will, no doubt, take care that the buildings are reasonably well constructed, but they cannot see into the future, and they cannot be too minute in their restrictions, because they may be attacked by unpopularity, which no department, whether a Government Department or a local authority, is willing to submit to. We ought to take care that the number of years is so extended that oppression may not exist, but at the same time we must also take care that the term is not so long as to leave to posterity, who will have their own wants in their own day, a burden possibly heavier than they can bear.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I wish to refresh the memory of the right hon. Gentleman in connection with this matter. He spoke on the Second Reading in very conciliatory terms as to the period of the repayment of the loans.

MR. CHAPLIN: No.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: In that case I have on a former occasion thanked the right hon. Gentleman for nothing.

MR. CHAPLIN: I adhere to my position that there should be no extension of the period.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider the matter as favourably as he can, and to point out also to the Committee that in any new clause of this kind discretion is left to the Local Government Board, the period of one hundred years or seventy years being the maximum. In a colliery district the Local Government Board would be quite aware of the limitations, and they would make the loan for a shorter period. All cases would be treated on their merits.

MR. CHAPLIN: In this Amendment all that is asked for with regard to buildings is a difference between sixty and seventy years. I am opposed to granting any concession with reference to buildings for the reasons which I stated on the Second Reading of the Bill. The relief as between sixty and seventy years with regard to buildings, according to the best calculation I can make, would create a less difference than a halfpenny a week for the rooms inhabited.

*MR. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston): I hope that the Government will take a firm attitude on this question of repayment of loans. The great permanent danger which every Government, which represents self-government by the people, is exposed to is the temptation of letting its finances go wrong because of the immediate pressure of the representatives of the people, who cannot be expected to be statesmen, having a view of the distant future as well as of the immediate future. Therefore there is a perpetual tendency to spend money and to raise money on terms that are light to the people who vote but will be heavy to their posterity. Now the great reason why we should insist on loans being repaid in short periods is this, that the advantages of spending public money on objects that we are desirous to obtain is plain to us, because it is an advantage of the moment. The question of the permanency of that advantage, as to whether after fifty or sixty years the way in which we have spent the money with our present knowledge will be advantageous to the people of that time, is a thing we can only guess at, and the consequence is that we are certain to give too much weight to these motives that spring from present convenience and too little thought as to how valuable this thing will be after fifty or sixty years. Let me just take an example. We build a building which we feel we want at present; we buy land which we feel is exceedingly convenient under present circumstances; but who can feel that he can speak with anything like certainty as to whether a building of that kind will be suited to the wants of the people after sixty years, or whether that land will not have lost greatly in value and greatly in convenience after so long a time has passed? We ought therefore to start with the principle that we will repay the money in a far shorter period than would be necessary if the need and the convenience of to-day were going to be the need and convenience of another hundred years. What are the periods we attribute to the repayment of the loans? Why, here is a request that it should be seventy and one hundred years. But who in the world can foresee whether posterity in seventy years and one hundred years will be reaping the same advantage from the spending of money that we are reaping to-day from it? And as we are going to give them an equal share in repaying these loans, we ought to be sure at least that they will produce as much advantage to them as they are producing to us. Seeing the great danger of the pressure of the people to-day upon us, and the much greater force that the circumstances of the day have in influencing us as compared with the circumstances of the dim and distant future, we ought always to err on the safe side. I think we have gone much too far already, and I trust the Government will not go any further.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 69; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 158.)

AYES.

Allan, William (Gateshead
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell-Bannermann, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Alston
Colville, John
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur

Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Evans, Samuel T.
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gedge, Sydney
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert Jn.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harrington, Timothy
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)
Kinloch, Sir Jn. Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James

Lough, Thomas
Lowles, John
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Maddison, Fred.
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morris, Samuel
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Morton, Ed. J. C. (Devonport)
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John

Oldroyd, Mark
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Trevelyan, Charles Phillips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Williams, John Carvell (Notts)
Yoxall, James Henry
TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Hazell and Mr. Steadman.

NOES.

Allsopp, Hon. George
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Brist'l
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh
Ceyzer, Sir Chales William
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wor'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. E. D. T.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Donkin, Richard Sim
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Faber, George Denison
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Garfit, William
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hamond, Sir C. (Newcastle)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence
Hedderwick, Thos. Chas. H.
Helder, Augustus
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn (Swansea
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
More, Robt. J. (Shropshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pender, Sir James
Penn, John
Philipps, John Wynford
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs. Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. Horace C.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir Thos. (Hartlep'l
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Robson, William Snowdon
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, W. E. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Usborne, Thomas
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, Hy. J. (York, W.R)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Younger, William
TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The next clause, in the name of the hon. Member for Ilkeston, seems to raise the same question. The first clause standing in the name of the hon. Member for South-west Bethnal Green has been disposed of by the last division.

MR. PICKERSGILL: The object of the Amendment I am about to move is to empower local authorities, if necessary, to hire land instead of purchasing for the purposes of this Bill. My contention is that it should be possible for the local authority to take a perpetual lease of land at a rent which would be equivalent to its present net annual value. This may seem to be rather an advanced proposal, but it is really only carrying a little further a principle which has already been adopted into the legislation of this country. It is a principle which is recognised in regard to allotments, and the history of the allotments question with reference to this matter is most significant and instructive. When the Allotments Act of 1887 was under consideration it was recognised that there might be a necessity for applying compulsory powers, and those compulsory powers were to be applied to the purchase of land. No one at that time suggested that they should be applied to the hiring of land. Time went on, and in 1893-4, when the Local Government Bill was before the House, public opinion on this point had made considerable advances. I remember perfectly well how bitterly at that time this very principle of giving compulsory powers to hire land as compared with the previously existing powers to purchase land was opposed. It was opposed, in particular, very bitterly and strongly—I will not say violently—by the present President of the Local Government Board, who said, I believe, that no civilised Government in the world, except that of Mr. Gladstone, would have brought forward such a proposal. Notwithstanding the violence with which the principle was attacked it was accepted by the House, and has now been for some years on the Statute-book. In the same way I propose to extend the principle to the acquisition of land for the purpose we are considering to-night. This is a question which is very much agitated outside this House. It is recognised that we are in need of very drastic reforms in regard to the principles upon which land may be acquired, and that being so it does not seem desirable or expedient that in all cases the local authority should prejudice the event by being required to purchase land instead of leasing it. I dare say this proposal will be defeated to-night, but having regard to the interest which the matter excites outside I think one ought to have the courage to take the opinion of the House of Commons upon it, and I beg therefore to move this clause.

New clause—

"A local authority shall have power to hire land for the purposes of Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, as amended by this Act, and sub-sections two, three, four, and five of section ten of the Local Government Act, 1894, shall apply for the determination of questions arising in connection with such hiring."—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

—brought up and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHAPLIN: There is nothing whatever in the clause of the hon. Member to show whether he proposes that the acquisition of land for the purpose of building houses by hire should be compulsory or not.

MR. PICKERSGILL: Oh, yes! The sub-section would have no meaning if that were not so.

MR. CHAPLIN: Quite so; I do not think it has any meaning. But I understand from the speech of the hon. Member that that is the object of the clause, because if it was to be done by agreement the authorities could do it without any assistance from any new clause. It is quite true that when the compulsory hiring proposal with regard to allotments was debated I opposed it, and I adhere to the views I then expressed and supported by my vote. I still think it is a wrong principle, and an abuse of legislation, although it was carried at the time by the majority of that particular Parliament. I would remind the hon. Member that even if Parliament sanctioned the hiring of land compulsorily for the purpose of allotments, that is a totally different thing from sanctioning the hiring of land for the purpose of erecting thereon buildings. In the one case it is necessarily permanent, while in the other case it is only for a period, and when the period of hire for the purpose of allotments comes to an end the land can be restored to its owner in practically the same condition as when it was leased. But the case is wholly different in regard to buildings. I am confident the Committee will agree that it is wrong to hire land by compulsion for a purpose and in a way which precludes the possibility of that land being returned to its owner at the end of the period of hire in the same condition. I think the Amendment of the hon. Member is entirely out of reason; it practically amounts to saying that you are to take away the property of some particular person because you desire it for a great public purpose, but that you are not to pay any capital sum whatever for it.

*MR. CHANNING: I am really astonished at the speech of the right hon. Gentleman on this point. After hearing the remarks he has just made one would think that he would pose as the strongest possible opponent of the leasehold system in all our great towns, and that we should have him coming forward as an ardent reformer of the tenure of land in towns.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is not compulsory.

*Mr. CHANNING: That is not compulsory, of course. But we need not enter into those details. [Ironical laughter.] Well, if I am obliged to occupy the time of the Committee by entering into this question, the right hon. Gentleman was saying that the property would not be returned to its owner in the same condition as land hired for allotments would be returned. I should imagine if a local authority acquired land as a leasehold for building purposes the value of the reversion would be very much the same at the end of the leasing term as the value which the Duke of Westminster and other ground landlords in London and elsewhere receive from their reversions. It seems to me that the argument is absolutely the same in both cases. What we really wish to do—and it does seem to me that the arguments made against this proposal are somewhat frivolous—is to provide as many means and methods as possible for enabling the local authorities to carry out the desirable purpose of providing healthy homes for the people. The right hon. Gentleman has not shown any cause whatever why the local authorities should not have this power. If they have the power to hire land compulsorily for providing cabbage grounds and things of that kind it seems to me *a fortiori* they should have the same power in order to meet the greatest evil of the present time.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 81; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 159.)

AYES.

Asher, Alexander
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Colville, John
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harrington, Timothy
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thos. Chas. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Maddison, Fred.
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morris, Samuel
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
Oldroyd, Mark
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Steadman, William Charles
Strachey, Edward
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Pickersgill and Mr. Channing.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Cornwallis,FiennesStanleyW.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw.T.D.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, SirWilliamTheodore
Dyke,Rt.HonSirWilliamHart
Faber, George Denison
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Hamilton,Rt.Hn.Lord George
Hamond, Sir Chas. (Newcastle
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Hardy, Laurence
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. W. E. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir D. (Swansea)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Liverpool)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver,SirLewis (Edinb'gh,W.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh.
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Penn, John
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs Newton
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, RtHnHoraceCurzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l
Ridley,Rt.Hn.SirMatthewW.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild,Hon.LionelWalter
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell,Gen.F.S.(Cheltenham
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson,Wm.Edw.Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Usborne, Thomas
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby,Lt.-Col.ACE(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon.JohnLloyd
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams,JosephPowell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N)
Wodehouse,RtHon.E.R.(Bath
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young,Commander(Berks,E.)
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The first Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Hoxton has been disposed of. The second is in order.

MR. STUART: The new clause I have to move is one with regard to the keeping of accounts. It deals with a very important matter in which we in London, and, I take it, those in most large towns, are greatly interested. The state of things — and I will as briefly as possible explain to the Committee a rather complicated situation—is this. When you have a street improvement or the clearance of an insanitary area under Part I. or Part II., when you have purchased the property, cleared the land, and begun to erect workmen's dwellings thereon, you have first of all to reduce the value of the land to a very much lower figure than you could obtain for it if you were to erect shops and warehouses and ordinary houses. You, therefore, drop a certain amount of money in that scheme. That money has clearly to be found somewhere or other in connection with the improvement scheme generally to which I have referred. In a good many cases it is found that it is better to erect the working-class dwellings not upon the same area, but upon another area, and to erect upon the first area shops or warehouses or something else which bring in a considerably larger sum to the municipality than the dwellings would. If the whole of this undertaking is done at once, and if under the same scheme you lay hold of land compulsorily or by agreement outside that area upon which to erect these houses, you erect them altogether under Part I. or Part II., the whole thing can be treated as one transaction, and the saving made by not erecting the houses on the original area is transferred to or is part of the rest of the scheme, and goes in reduction of the cost of the building scheme which is undertaken outside the original area. But this cannot be done as a matter of account if the outside area is acquired under Part III. If the outside area is acquired under a different scheme from that under which the other area is acquired, you cannot fuse the accounts. It is very desirable, in London at any rate, that you should be able to acquire land under Part III., and then, when you have got a clearence scheme under Part I., to use the land you have already acquired under Part III. to erect thereon the houses which you do not erect on the land acquired under Part I. You are able to take up a piece of land under Part III., when you have in contemplation an improvement under Part I. or Part II., much more cheaply than if you have to wait and do it in conjunction with the Part I. scheme. It is therefore a very practical matter in London that we should be able to proceed in the following manner—to take a piece of ground under Part III. for the erection of working-class dwellings, allocate it to that purpose, then to secure the Part I. scheme, and then to have a transference of the houses from the Part I. scheme to the piece of ground we have purchased under Part III. We have done that in several instances with very great advantage and saving to the public purse. But it will be observed that, because of the complete isolation necessarily of the one set of accounts from the other, the improvement scheme under Part. I. or Part II. gets the benefit of the profit that is made by not erecting workmen's dwellings there, and the scheme of workmen's dwellings erected under Part III. is punished by having to bear the whole expense of the site under Part III. I could give several instances, but I will give only one very important instance at present under consideration. In a great street improvement that we are making just now, we bought a large brewery at a cost of £200,000. Unless we get leave, as we should do, to erect the workmen's dwellings upon our piece of land, that site will have to be written down in value to about £35,000. There is, therefore, a dead loss to the public, if the land is devoted to workmen's dwellings, of £165,000 on that part of the transaction. But if we devote the site of the brewery to warehouses, shops, and the like, we shall get back about the same amount as we gave for the brewery, and there will be a profit on that particular street improvement scheme of £165,000 by erecting the workmen's dwellings outside. Now we go to a piece of land secured by us under Part III., and erect the workmen's dwellings there, but we have to charge the new scheme with the whole value of the site which we have purchased under Part III. What we desire to do is to make the profit made upon the first scheme follow the workmen's dwellings into the new scheme. I hope I have made that clear. It makes no difference to the general public, but it throws a charge upon the improvement which ought properly to bear that charge. It will make a very great difference to the cost of the scheme regarded as a mere building scheme of working-class dwellings. I have already pointed out the kind of difference in the facts with respect to the brewery, but, speaking generally, I think I can let the House understand what it would mean in the following way. The cost of the land for a set of working-class houses runs roughly to about one-sixth of the cost of the whole undertaking, the remainder being the cost of the erection of the buildings. As a rule, the land would cost us if unreduced in value about double the amount—and that is a very reasonable estimate—that it costs us when bought for workmen's dwellings. If we were allowed to charge it upon the original improvement, one-twelfth part of the undertaking would be saved. That would be the result in the case of the transfers I have just described. Of course it would not take place in every instance, because only a certain number are dealt with in this way. But the number is considerable, and it would be capable of being made a still greater saving. On a previous Amendment I pointed out that the provision made beforehand before the creation of working class dwellings was a very important matter. It is by purchasing under Part III. beforehand that we are able to provide beforehand the houses to which the displaced persons can go. Under Part III. we are able to make the rehousing proceed *pari passu* with the pulling down of the houses purchased under Part I. or Part II. The Amendment I have on the Paper is intended to carry out that transfer. I believe the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill is not opposed to the general idea that I have now placed before the Committee, and I have in my hand a slightly altered form of the clause which may meet with his acceptance. In its altered form two transactions are fused into one instead of carrying over the profits made in the one case to the other account, although the portions of that account are kept separate. In this altered form I beg leave to propose the Amendment which stands in my name.

New clause—

"Where land acquired by a council under Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, is appropriated for the purpose of rehousing persons displaced by the council under the powers of any other Part of that Act or of any other enactment, the receipts and expenditure in respect of that land (including all costs in respect of the acquisition and laying out of the land), and of any buildings erected thereon, may be treated as receipts and expenditure under that Part or enactment, but shall be accounted for under a separate head."—(*Mr. Stuart.*)

—brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHAPLIN: The hon. Member on more than one occasion has discussed this proposal with me outside these walls, and I have had the advantage of hearing a deputation from the London County Council explaining their views upon this particular subject. I am, therefore, able to follow without difficulty the views which the hon. Member has put before the Committee this evening, which I think will not be perfectly simple to those who are not initiated in the subject. The position is this. Under the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890 the authorities are bound to keep separate accounts of the works which are transacted. The Council buy a slum somewhere in London for the purposes of clearing the houses, and they have to purchase land elsewhere in order to rehouse the same number of people they displace. If the Council rehouse these people on land in the centre of London, it will be extremely difficult and costly, because the land is very expensive, and might be put to a much more profitable purpose. The Council desire to undertake these clearing operations, and for the purpose of rehousing the displaced population they seek power to buy land elsewhere at a cheaper rate as part of the whole transaction. I hope that will occur to a greater extent than it does at present, for under the provisions of the Bill they will be enabled to go beyond the metropolitan area. The Council say that if they can make a profit on one part of the transaction, it is rather hard on them that they should not be able to take credit for that profit in carrying out the other part of the transaction. At present they contend that this is impossible because of the provision laid down in the Act of 1890, that totally separate accounts should be kept for each part of the Act. I understand that the County Council have a standing order by which they are precluded from carrying out any scheme which will not pay for the whole transaction without making any additional charge. That, I believe, is the position in which they are placed at present, and it is to relieve them from that position that this proposal is made. There is no apprehension of any muddling or mixing of accounts, because the Amendment states very clearly that—

"The receipts and expenditure in respect of that land (including all costs in respect of the acquisition and laying out of the land), and of any building erected thereon, may be treated as receipts and expenditure under that Part or enactment, but shall be accounted for under a separate head."

Under these circumstances, I am quite ready to accept the Amendment, and I am all the more pleased to do it because I understand the hon. Member to say that it will be a real and substantial assistance to the County Council.

Question put, and agreed to; clause added.

MR. LOUGH: The object of the clause I now have to move is to increase the borrowing powers of the Council in carrying out this Act. It is based upon a clause in the Public Health Act of 1875, under which Act the Council have, in addition to the borrowing powers they possess, the power of acquiring property for the purposes of disposal of sewage. The object of this Amendment is to give the same facilities with regard to any land or buildings which they may require under this Act. I think it is a most reasonable Amendment, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will see his way to accept it.

New clause—

"Any council shall, in respect of land, buildings, and other property acquired under Part III. of The Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, as amended by this Act, have the same powers of borrowing money on mortgage as are, by Sections 235 to 239, inclusive, of The Public Health Act, 1875, conferred upon any local authority in respect of land, works, or other property acquired for the purposes of disposal of sewage."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

—brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHAPLIN: I do not quite understand what is the real object of this clause, and I do not see how it is going to improve the position of the local authorities. What the hon. Member proposes is to give the local authorities everywhere the power to mortgage their property, but they borrow their money at present upon the security of the rates. The only effect f the Amendment would be that in case the revenue was insufficient the mortgagee would be able to take possession of public property and seize it at once. I do not see that there is anything to gain in the case of sewage works, for in that case there is no available revenue whatever to place as security for the loan. But, however that may be, it is an entirely new proposal with regard to sewage, and I am not prepared to accept it.

MR. LOUGH: It seems to me that the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman might be made a little more clear. He has put forward two objections to the acceptance of this Amendment. He says he does not see what advantage it confers, and he explained that it increases the borrowing powers of the Council. I may say that that is the main object of my proposal.

MR. CHAPLIN: I did not say that.

MR. LOUGH: I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that. The second objection raised was that the mortgagee might seize the property, but as long as he was paid his interest he could not seize it. If circumstances arose under which this money could not be paid the work would cease to be remunerative.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I think the right hon. Gentleman might give consideration to this Amendment. I understand one of his objections to be that the security of the rates would include the property or land belonging to the local authority, but that does not follow. There may be two forms of security, upon the rates payable by the inhabitants as occupiers, and security upon the land possessed by the local authority. In the latter case there would be an increase in the borrowing power if it had powers similar to those under the Public Health Act of raising money upon mortgage. Under the Public Health Act there need be no sinking fund, and therefore this would be a perfectly safe loan, because a margin of one-fourth under the Public Health Act is required as between the amount advanced and the purchase price of the property, and, there being no sinking fund, it might be a loan in perpetuity on security, not of the rates, but only of the particular property. I think this proposal would be a material and beneficial advantage if applied to this Bill.

Question put and negatived.

*MR. WHITMORE: I beg to move the clause standing in my name. The object of this clause is to enable the local authority to lease out the land to some party or individual, who will be obliged to use that land strictly in accordance with the purposes of the Act. This clause is supported by many hon. Members on this side of the House who have had a good deal of experience in regard to the working of this class of property. We all wish as many local authorities as possible to avail themselves of the powers of this Act, but many people are rather doubtful how far the local authorities will avail themselves of this power without such a provision as I have proposed. Surely it would be better that a local authority should have the power to lease the land to a competent authority. I propose this new clause as an enlarging clause, and not as a restricting clause at all. I am sure that hon. Members on both sides of the House will agree that it will be very hard to put upon some local authorities the erection and the subsequent management of these large buildings. Surely it will be better if they have the power to lease the land to somebody who understands the question. That is the view which many hon. Members of the London County Council hold on both sides, and it is with this object that I propose this clause.

New clause—

"(1) The local authority, if not a rural district council, with the consent of the Local Government Board, and if a rural district council with the consent of the county council, may lease any land acquired by them under and for the purposes of Part 3 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') to any lessee for the purpose and under the condition that the lessee will carry the Act into execution by building and maintaining on the land lodging-houses within the meaning of the Act; and the local authority may insert in any lease all such provisions as they may think fit for insuring the user of the land and buildings for lodging-houses within the meaning of the Act, and in particular the local authority may insert in any lease provisions binding the lessee to build on the land as in the lease prescribed, and to maintain and repair the buildings, and securing the use of the buildings exclusively as lodging-houses within the meaning of the Act, and prohibiting any addition to or alteration of the character of the buildings without the consent of the local authority; and also a provision for the re-entry of the local authority on the land on the breach of any of the terms of the lease; and every deed or instrument of demise of the land or buildings shall be endorsed with notice of this subsection. (2) Sections 61 and 62 of the Act shall not extend to any lodging-house to which this Act applies."—(*Mr. Whitmore.*)

—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. STUART: I do not like this clause much, for you are going to use the compulsory power of the municipality to take people's land from them, and let it out for the benefit of private individuals or private companies. I think we should leave private companies to purchase their own land, and this seems to me to be a very dangerous clause.

MR. CHAPLIN: I do not see the difficulty which the hon. Gentleman has pointed out. The clause is purely permissive, and it only proposes to confer upon the local authority under Part III. of the Act of 1890 the same powers that they possess at present under Part I. of the Act for purposes of a precisely similar character. It seems to me that there are some advantages in this proposition, and I do not see anything in it to justify the hon. Member's apprehension. It is quite true that the land is acquired compulsorily by the local authority, but I do not see why the local authority should be precluded, if it chooses, from letting the land to other people instead of carrying out the work themselves. That is all this new clause proposes, and it provides the most ample safeguards for seeing that the work is done and properly carried out according to their instructions, and the local authority retain powers of re-entry. I should be disposed to accept the clause, but I should like to suggest one or two small drafting Amendments.

MR. STUART: I might point out that there is a difference between the application of this principle to Part I. and Part III. In Part I. you have to deal with a state of things where there has been some real and practical breach of the public interest on the part of the possessors of the land, and you are obliged to come in there to preserve public health. In Part III. you are dealing with land, and with persons guilty of no breach of public trust. They have done no damage to the land, and you are going to take their land compulsorily for the purpose of handing it over to be dealt with by a private company. I think there is a very distinct difference between leaving this clause to be applied to Part I. and extending it to Part III.

MR. COHEN: I think my hon. friend has not quite apprehended the object of this clause. The county council is not acquiring the land for the purpose of handing it over to a private company, but for the purpose of erecting working-class dwellings, and this clause will enable the council, after it has acquired the land, to confide the duty of erecting houses to a third party if it thinks it would be advantageous to do so. I think my hon. friend will recollect that on the London County Council we have found sometimes that we have not been able to erect these working-class dwellings on such terms as would enable us to let them upon the low terms which we desire to give to the tenants. In this proposal we have the facility, and that is all we propose.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The hon. Member who has just sat down seems to be under a misapprehension. This proposal is not for the London County Council alone, but it applies to any local authority, urban or rural. Therefore, we cannot discuss this measure as a purely London Bill, and we have to look at it from the point of view of other municipalities in the country, who have just as much claim as the powerful body to which the hon. Member belongs. My objection to this clause is that it holds out an enormous temptation to the smaller rural councils of the country to give way to arrangements with local builders instead of doing their own business. Although no such idea may have entered the minds of those who support this proposal, in practice it might lead to a system of local jobbery, and if my hon. friend goes to a division I shall oppose this proposition.

*SIR F. S. POWELL: One of the greatest difficulties we have always felt in the application of public funds for the purpose of housing the people has been that it has a tendency to drive away private capital. The clause proposed by my hon. friend invites the co-operation of private capital, and I am perfectly sure that under the Act the erection of these dwellings will become far more extensive if this co-operation is made possible. As regards the dangers suggested by the noble Lord as to arrangements with jerry builders and so forth, if the local authority is fit to be trusted with this Act it is also fit to be trusted to avoid the meshes and entanglements of the jerry builders. I think myself that this is a clause of more value than any other clause in the Bill, for I believe it will greatly extend the operations of this measure, and multiply the buildings erected under it. I do not think that it is liable to the suggestion which the noble Lord has made.

MR. LOUGH: I do hope that this clause will be looked into very carefully before it is accepted. The object of this Bill is to enable local authorities to step in where private enterprise has failed. If private enterprise can provide these houses, there is no necessity for the local authority to do so, and they do not interfere. But where private enterprise fails, then the local authority comes along and buys the land, and I think it is necessary that the local authority should itself complete the work it has commenced. If the local authority takes the course contemplated by this clause, it will open the door to jobbery in a variety of ways which it is our duty to guard against. My hon. friend suggests that the local authority should acquire a piece of land, and after the land has been acquired difficulties will be suggested. It will be said "we cannot develop this ourselves," and probably it will be suggested that an advantageous piece of the land should be given to some friend, possibly, of a member of the council, to develop. All this is a very dangerous proceeding. I think the local authority should look well into the whole business before it commences, and if it does not see its way to take advantage of the borrowing powers it should not commence the work. This proposal will restore some of those evils in our local bodies, which it has been the object of recent legislation to get rid of. I do hope the right hon. Gentleman will consider this clause more fully before adopting it.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 165; Noes, 84. (Division list No. 160.)

AYES.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bethell, Commander
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw. T. D.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, George Denison
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Godson, Sir A. Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon

Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice.

Goschen, Rt. Hn. G. J. (St. Geo.'s
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hammond, Sir C. (Newcastle)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Hardy, Laurence
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. Wm. Edw. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn Sir Dillwyn-(Swans'a
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Liverpool
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Penn, John
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs., Newton
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hn. H. Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartle'pl)
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman Walter
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Cheltenhm)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. F. W. D. (Strand)
Stock, James Henry
Strauss, Arthur
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Tauntn
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams, Jsph. Powell-(Birm.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Hnry
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)

Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry

Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William

Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Harrington, Timothy
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)

Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James

Lough, Thomas

Macaleese, Daniel
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Maddison, Fred.
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carm'th'n)
Morley, Rt. Hn. J. (Montrose)
Morris, Samuel
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans

O'Dowd, John
Oldroyd, Mark

Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Phillips, John Wynford
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh

Robson, William Snowdon

Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Steadman, William Charles
Strachey, Edward
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)

Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r

Ure, Alexander

Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Govan)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudders'd

Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice
and Mr. James Stuart.

Drafting Amendments made.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11 to omit the word 'may' in order to insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

MR. MOULTON: May I suggest that it would be rather serious to make the alteration proposed statutable? Surely we can trust the county councils more than that.

MR. HOBHOUSE: My object is to provide that the land shall be used for building.

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. F. S. POWELL said the object of the Amendment which he now moved was to provide that the lessee should be compelled to insure the buildings. He might not be in a position to replace them if they were destroyed.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 13, after the word 'repair,' to insert the words 'and insure.'"—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. GEDGE (Walsall): I think it would be much better to let the insurance be effected in the first instance by the local authority. I doubt, if the insurance were thrown on the tenant, whether it would be effected at all. It amounts to the same thing in the long run, because the lessor can add the amount of the insurance premium to the rent.

MR. CHAPLIN: It appears to me that we are now entering upon minute details which the local authorities are surely the proper authorities to settle.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAPLIN proposed in line 19 after the word "sub-section" to add "provided that in the case of a council in London the consent of a Secretary of State shall be substituted for the consent of the Local Government Board." He moved that because under all the existing Acts a Secretary of State was the authority, not the Local Government Board.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for South Islington has been already disposed of. The first clause of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Stepney has also been disposed of. The second clause is in order.

MR. STEADMAN: In moving this clause I have in my mind that if the London County Council at the present time wish to acquire land, and they have to acquire it under the Lands Clauses Act, they have not only to pay the full market value but 10 per cent. in addition. The noble Lord the Member for the Cricklade Division has stated that this is not a London Bill alone. I quite agree, but I think I am on safer ground in dealing with my own practical experience in London than in dealing with rural districts regarding which I have no experience. The present law will entail not only great cost on the ratepayers of London but also great hardship on the tenants who occupy the dwellings built by the London County Council. Reid's brewery was purchased for a sum of £200,000 with the object of rehousing some of the people that will be displaced owing to the improvement scheme which the Council are now carrying through. It is proposed to rehouse 2,000 people on the site of Reid's Brewery, and the cost of purchasing that site works out at no less a sum than £100 for every man, woman, and child that will occupy the buildings. Reid's Brewery paid a certain sum in rates to the parish which was fixed on the assessment value, and it was a case in which there might be a fair claim for goodwill. But when the Council acquire vacant land there is no goodwill attaching to it, and it is not assessed, and therefore pays no rates. The landowner simply holds the land until such time as he thinks he can command a good price for it, and then he sells it. I consider our present system is a very unjust one. When the County Council acquire the land they have to pay through the nose for it, and if they acquire it through the Lands Clauses Act they have to pay even a higher price still. I think myself that no fairer basis can be taken for purchase than the assessment for rates. It is no argument to say that because land is not assessed it should not be purchased at its assessable value. I think that would be a much better and much cheaper system for the local authorities than the present system. In the clause I now propose I am fair to the landowner, because I am willing to allow him for any increase of the value of his land brought about, not by himself, but by any improvement which the local authority may have carried out in the neighbourhood.

New clause—

"For the purposes of Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, a local authority may acquire land compulsorily at a price based on the annual value assessed for taxation, and they may schedule any site for acquisition within five years from the date of the notice of their intention to the owner, and may take possession six months after notice has been served upon the said owner. The price to be paid for such land shall not exceed the value of the land when it is scheduled, plus any additional value accruing at the rate of the average annual increase of value of the site for five years previous to the date of such scheduling."—(*Mr. Steadman.*)

—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. CHAPLIN: I have no doubt that the intentions of the hon. Member are admirable, but this clause seems to me one of the most remarkable that was ever drafted. The land is to be taken compulsorily at its value as "assessed for taxation." I suppose the hon. Member means rateable value. He then went on to tell us that vacant land was not assessed at all, and therefore I suppose that the purchase price in that case would be absolutely nothing. At present land can only be taken by compulsion under a Provisional Order or by an Act of Parliament, with safeguards which give the landowner reasonable security that he will receive a fair payment. Apparently this is not to be so under this clause. Land is to be taken compulsorily, and there is not a word about the machinery to be provided. The land is to be taken by the local authorities at their own sweet will, and I suppose at any number of years purchase they please, because there is not a word about that in the clause. Then again, land is to be scheduled, though how is not explained; nor is it explained how notice is to be given to the landowner. The meaning of land being scheduled, so far as I can judge, is that if there is a rise in the value of the land, the local authority is to have power to take it from the owner five years after being scheduled at, I think the hon. Member said, an increase of 5 per cent., although the land may have increased in value 50 per cent. or 100 per cent. I do not find in the clause any corresponding provision for dealing with land that has been scheduled and that has decreased in value. If there is a fall in the value of the land the local authority is not bound to take it. It appears to me to be a case of "Heads I win, tails you lose." I think it is one of the most harum-scarum proposals ever submitted to the House.

Mr. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): May I ask the hon. Member for Stepney if these clauses were drafted by anyone on the London County Council?

Mr. STEADMAN: The reply to the hon. Member is in the negative. In reply to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board, he seemed rather to ridicule this clause, but, after all, the question under discussion is no laughing matter to the working classes of London. The landowner to-day can keep his land vacant as long as he likes. Fifty years back it may have been only worth a song, but land is increasing in value year after year, and the landowner knows that. What does it matter to him if the working classes cannot be housed? A man called on me on Saturday afternoon in my own constituency. He had been bundled out of his house with his wife and family, and had not a place to lay his head. He had to go round to some friends seeking accommodation until such time as he could find one or two rooms. The landowner is indifferent to all that. He says, "The land belongs to me"—though I should like to know who gave it to him in the first place—and like Shylock he insists upon having his pound of flesh before he parts with it. If land is not assessed I say it should be assessed, and if vacant land were compelled to pay rates landlords would not be so ready to hold it, and would be prepared to sell it at a reasonable price, Let the local authority, who assess our buildings and houses at present, assess the land also, and let them have the power to purchase that land on its assessment value.

MR. MADDISON: The right hon. Gentleman in his eloquence spoke of this clause as a harum-scarum proposal, and the hon. Member for East Finsbury, with his well-known love for the working classes, had nothing to contribute to this debate except an unworthy insinuation against my hon. friend the Member for Stepney. It would have been more to the point if the hon. Member for East Finsbury had attempted, in some way or other, to controvert the principle on which this clause is based, and to have helped my hon. friend to improve the clause. Candidly, I cannot support this clause as it is drafted; but I really think it is a little unfair for the hon. Member for East Finsbury to indulge in what is almost ridicule at the expense of my hon. friend. He does not profess to be a statesman. He has no professional draughtsman at his beck and call, and he has to depend, in a very special way, upon facilities which are not of the best. But, after all, the principle of this clause goes to the very root of the real trouble of the housing problem. In the course of the debate it has been repeatedly pointed out that this is not a purely London question, and I venture to say that if hon. Members went to members of corporations throughout the country, who are brought face to face with the housing problem in its most acute form, and asked them to put their finger on its root difficulty they would say, unless they were Moderates of the London County Council type, that it was the difficulty of getting cheap land. There can be no doubt that my hon. friend sees the difficulty of getting land at all, at any sort of price, having regard on the one hand to the interests of the ratepayers, and on the other hand to the necessity of getting houses for the working classes. The House will have to face this problem some of these days. We shall have to assert the sound economic and sacred principle that land does not exist for private convenience and profit, and that wherever that private convenience or profit runs athwart the very necessities of the people in the matter of housing, the landlords will have to sell their land at a fair price. The purpose of the clause is to preserve the very life of the people. Everybody knows that the landowners are exacting what is really a blood tax on the community. More than that, sometimes the corporations are not prepared to pay the blood tax, and something still worse happens. Therefore, when my hon. friend seeks to secure a more equitable basis for the purchase of land than now exists, he wishes to establish a principle which has had the support of some of the greatest economists of the day, and which cannot at all be called revolutionary. The right hon. the President of the Local Government Board, in his vigorous attack on the hon. Member for Stepney, turned his proposed clause upside down, and the right hon. Gentleman's speech got more confused than the clause itself. The right hon. Gentleman is the champion of the landowners, but, at any rate, he might have been fair even to my hon. friend the Member for Stepney. I regret that my hon. friend has not been able to clothe the great principle contained in this clause in more suitable Parliamentary and legal language; but I am here to say, and I say it sincerely, that instead of the jeers which came from benches opposite, credit might have been given him for the courage, which I am sure elicits our admiration, with which he has endeavoured to put, not a harum-scarum scheme, but a sound, economic, and just proposal, before the House. Its only defect is that he has failed to adopt a form of drafting best fitted to meet the case; but he has done more than the hon. Member for East Finsbury, who poses as the hero of the working classes.

Question put, and negatived.

SIR WALTER FOSTER said he wished to move a clause relating to the powers of medical officers of health in reference to the insanitary conditions of houses; but as the clause was not on the Paper, and was rather a lengthy one, he would move it, with permission, on the Report stage.

*MR. CHANNING said that the clause of which he gave notice at an early stage of the Bill would, he understood, come in here. The principle of this clause was contained in Parts I. and II. of the Act of 1890, and what he proposed was that the same principles should be applied to the acquisition of land under Part III. for the provision of houses for the working classes by local authorities outside their areas. He had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman would say that the Government would accept the first part of his clause, but possibly not the more controversial part, which stated that the arbitrator should not make any allowance in respect of compulsory purchase. They were face to face with a tremendous problem in our great towns, and what he asked the Committee to affirm was that the provision of house accommodation to prevent overcrowding was a question of equally urgent importance with the dealing with insanitary areas, and unhealthy houses. Those who were familiar with the evidence given before the Royal Commission would remember the argument of the Colonial Secretary in reply to questions of Lord Salisbury. The Colonial Secretary then supported the principle of this clause, and urged that the extra compensation in respect of compulsory purchase was withheld from the owners of healthy, as well as unhealthy, houses within the insanitary area in the public interest. The same reasoning held here. This question of overcrowding, and the evil of single-roomed houses, is one of imperative importance in the interests of humanity and of our country.

New clause—

"The price of any land taken by a rural district council for the purposes of this Act otherwise than by agreement shall be determined by a single arbitrator to be named by the Local Government Board, and the arbitrator in determining the price of such land shall not make any addition in respect of compulsory purchase."—(*Mr. Channing.*)

—brought up and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHAPLIN: If the hon. Member had moved the clause limiting his proposal to the rural districts, I should have had no difficulty in accepting the first part of his clause. I quite agree with that part, but as to the second part, while I think it is very desirable to cheapen the price of land for a great national purpose, there is no reason whatever why, in regard to land which is not insanitary, and which is outside the area which is taken for a particular purpose, for the first time, the owners of that particular property should be subject to a disability from which other owners are free. Why should the owners of such land be debarred from the advantage, if advantage it was, of obtaining a decision by the appointed tribunal?

*MR. CHANNING: To cheapen the price of the land.

MR. CHAPLIN: Cheapen the price of land if you please; but do not let the burden fall on one class of the community.

*MR. CHANNING said that he could not understand the objection to the principle of a single arbitrator in urban districts when it could be accepted as regards rural districts.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said there were a good many Parliamentary precedents for single arbitrators—the Light Railways Act, the Public Health (Scotland) Act, the Local Government (Scotland) Act; and the principle was sanctioned in the single arbitrators appointed by the Local Government Board. It was too late in the day for the President of the Local Government Board to say that there was something novel in it. It was found also in the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890. The President of the Local Government Board said that if the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire limited his clause to the first part he would accept it, but he (Mr. Caldwell) objected to all these bargains across the floor of the House. If it was right, why not adopt it at once? But if bargains were to be made they ought to be made behind the Speaker's chair. In regard to the second part of the clause, there was a precedent for it in the Housing of the Working Classes Act and the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1894, and he was astonished that the Government, having sanctioned the principle within the last three or four years in four or five different Acts of Parliament, should now refuse to adopt it in this Act. He was not going to talk the Bill out, but he asked the right hon. Gentleman to agree to the clause as it stood now, and if he wanted any modification in regard to the language they could consider that on the Report stage.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 161. (Division List No. 161.)

AYES.

Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Colville, John
Dalziel, James Henry
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Emmott, Alfred
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Harrington, Timothy
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thos. Charles H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez Ed.
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'lnd)
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Maddison, Fred.
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Morris, Samuel
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Oldroyd, Mark
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, J. (Stockton on Tees)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Capt. Jno. (Forfars.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Steadman, William Charles
Strachey, Edward
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Wilson, H. J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddrsfi'ld

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Channing and Mr. Dewar.

NOES.

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Brstl)
Beckett, Ernest William
Bethell, Commander
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worcr
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir Jn. Charles Ready
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw. T. D.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, George Denison
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (M'nc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G J (St. George's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt Hon. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn (Swansea
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Monckton, Edward Philip
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh.
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingtn
Penn, John
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir Thos. Hartlep'l
Ridley, Rt Hn Sir Matthew, W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Chelt'hm)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Seely, Charles Hilton
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stephens, Henry Charles
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.
Stock, James Henry
Strauss, Arthur
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, W. E. Murray
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Cl. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wrightson, Thomas
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 268.]

SUPPLY [22ND JUNE].

Resolutions reported:—

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900-1901.

CLASS II.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £51,299, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses in the Department of Her Majesty's Treasury and Subordinate Departments."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £7,340, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £11,028, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Agriculture, and to pay certain Grants in Aid."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £23,036, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Charity Commission for England and Wales."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,778, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Commissioners in Lunacy in England."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £67, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Mint, including the Expenses of Coinage."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,097, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Debt Office."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £12,838, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Public Record Office."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £15, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Establishment under the Public Works Loan Commissioners."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £23,702, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of the Registrar General of Births, etc., in England."

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £350,060, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Stationery, Printing, Paper, Binding, and Printed Books for the Public Service, and for the Salaries and Expenses of the Stationery Office; and for sundry Miscellaneous Services, including Reports of Parliamentary Debates."

Resolutions agreed to.

SUPPLY [24TH MAY].

Resolution reported :—

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS II.

"That a sum, not exceeding £32,339, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland."

Resolution agreed to.

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS AND GUARDIANS (TERM OF OFFICE) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

G.P.O.—TRANSFER TO MOUNT PLEASANT—POSTAL DELAYS.

On the Motion for Adjournment—

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I desire to draw the attention of the Secretary to the Treasury, as representative of the Postmaster General, to the grave inconvenience and great loss sustained by the public generally, and especially the commercial classes, in regard to the irregular and late delivery of letters. The complaint is universal; it amounts in the opinion of most to a scandal in the departmental administration of this country in regard to such matters. I know many cases in which not only great inconvenience has been caused, but commercial loss has ensued in consequence of the non-delivery of drafts and commercial documents. I am aware that some of these inconveniences may have resulted, in a measure, from the change of the sorting site from St. Martin's-le-Grand to Mount Pleasant, but I hope we will have some assurance that that change is rapidly being consummated, and that this great cause of complaint will cease. One other point as to the earlier posting of letters now required. I believe that that does not apply to the whole of London, but only to the E.C. district, the great commercial centre, and it is causing great commercial inconvenience and, by loss of time, material loss as well. I hope the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Post Office, will be able to give a satisfactory assurance on the subject.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I have to express, on behalf of the Postmaster General, his great regret at the inconvenience that has undoubtedly accompanied the transfer of a great number of sorters from St. Martin's-le-Grand to Mount Pleasant. But I have seen the Postmaster General, who assures me that the inconvenience was only temporary, and has, in his opinion, come to an end. It has arisen from the necessary transfer, owing to want of space at St. Martin's-le-Grand, of 2,500 sorters—a very difficult task to undertake without some temporary inconvenience. I asked the Postmaster General if the inconvenience was due to any shortness of the staff, and he assured me that in no way was the inconvenience due to the shortness of the staff, that they had all the men they want, and that the accommodation at Mount Pleasant was better than at St. Martin's-le-Grand. Therefore, there is every reason to believe that as soon as the men have shaken down to their work the cause of complaint will cease. There is another change in the postal arrangements which I may refer to. The shortening of the hours for the late postage of letters must, I am afraid, be permanent. All the sorting of letters for the provinces is to be done at Mount Pleasant. Letters for London or abroad will still be sorted at St. Martin's-le-Grand. But, owing to the greater distance of Mount Pleasant from the E.C. district, letters cannot be posted at St. Martin's-le-Grand at the former hours. They will have to be posted a quarter of an hour earlier—at 7.30 instead of 7.45. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that the regulation as to the posting of letters in letter-boxes with a late fee only applies to the E.C. district, and not to the whole of London. The sole alteration is this—that these late letters with the extra stamp cannot be posted in letter-boxes. It is found that the late fee letters form so small a proportion of those posted in these letter-boxes that they do not compensate for the inconvenience and delay caused by sorting all the letters on their account. At all the post offices except St. Martin's-le-Grand it will still be possible to post letters with a late stamp.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT: I thank the right hon. the Secretary to the Treasury for the satisfactory statement he has just made.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 26th June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Belfast and County Down Railway.
Great Northern Railway (Ireland).

Also the Certificates that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills :—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6).
Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law).
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8).

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with—

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3).
Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1).
Land Registry (New Buildings).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the following Bills :—

Metropolitan District Railway,
South Metropolitan Gas,

ought to be dispensed with, and the Bills allowed to proceed.

Read, and agreed to.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

A Petition of Messrs. Grahames, Currey, and Spens, of No. 30, Great George Street, Westminster, parliamentary agents, praying for leave to present a Petition of the promoters of the Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 93 for presenting such Petition has expired ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table ; and Standing Order No. 93 to be considered on Thursday next in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said Petition.

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE WATER BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

VALE OF RHEIDOL LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

Reported with an Amendment.

AIRDRIE, COATBRIDGE, AND DISTRICT WATER TRUST BILL.

HARTLEPOOL GAS AND WATER BILL.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

LANCASHIRE, DERBYSHIRE, AND EAST COAST RAILWAY BILL.

CITY OF LONDON ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL.

CLONTARF URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over To-morrow.

FRASER SETTLED CHATTELS BILL [H.L.].

CHRISTCHURCH AND BOURNEMOUTH TRAMWAYS BILL.

BLACKPOOL, ST. ANNE'S, AND LYTHAM TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 2^a.

BRITISH GASLIGHT COMPANY (STAFFORDSHIRE POTTERIES) BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

RICKMANSWORTH AND UXBRIDGE VALLEY WATER BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LANCASTER CORPORATION BILL.

ST. DAVID'S RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

WEST BROMWICH CORPORATION BILL.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

FARNWORTH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE, COMMERCIAL GAS, AND SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS COMPANIES BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

HALIFAX CORPORATION BILL.

HUDDERSFIELD CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

JARROW AND HEBBURN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL.

LAMBETH WATER BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LONDON AND SAINT KATHERINE DOCKS, AND EAST AND WEST INDIA DOCK COMPANIES BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

MID-KENT WATER BILL.

PORTLAND URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

SOUTHPORT AND LYTHAM TRAMROAD BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed.

WANDSWORTH AND PUTNEY GAS BILL.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL.

Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 2^a.

SOUTH SHIELDS CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

ROCHDALE CORPORATION BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

OSSETT CORPORATION GAS BILL.

SOUTHPORT EXTENSION AND TRAMWAYS BILL.

STOCKPORT CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD BILL [H.L.].

PAIGNTON URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL [H.L.].

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bills to be read 3^a on Friday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 1) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bills to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order) and passed.

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Read 2^a (according to Order), and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (GAS) BILL.

Read 2^a (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) BILL.

Read 2^a (according to Order).

GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Read 2^a (according to Order).

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [H.L.]

House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS.

I. Annual Series:—2461. Portugal (Goa); No. 2462. Turkey (Smyrna and district).

II. Miscellaneous Series:—No. 528. German Colonies, for the year ending 30th June, 1899; No. 529. Waterway between the Baltic and Black Sea.

COLONIES.

I. Annual:—No. 290. British Guiana (Reports for 1897–98 and 1898–99); No. 291. Falkland Islands (Report for 1899); No. 292. British New Guinea (Report for 1898–99); No. 293. Bermuda (Report for 1899).

II. Miscellaneous:—No. 13. Cook Islands (Report for 1899).

CYPRUS.

Annual Report for 1898–99.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT.

Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of St. Andrews to the Secretary for Scotland under the provisions of the Act.

PUBLIC RECORDS (COURT OF EXCHEQUER).

Schedule of classes of documents connected with actions arising out of seizures of goods, etc., or for the recovery of penalties under Acts relating to the customs or excise, and other process in matters relating to the revenue, which formerly were or ought to have been in the office of the King's or Queen's Remembrancer, or of the Exchequer, and which are now in, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in, the Public Record Office.

COUNTY TREASURERS (IRELAND) (FEE FUND).

Account for the year ended 25th March, 1900.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES).

Message from the Commons for leave for the Marquess of Bristol to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House.

JOURNAL COMMITTEE.

Report from, that the General Index to ten volumes of the Journals, viz., from the one hundred and sixteenth to the one hundred and twenty-fifth, both inclusive (47th and 48th Vict.—56th and 57th Vict.), is ready for delivery; the same to be delivered in the usual manner.

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION BILL.

Brought from the Commons. Read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Friday next.—(*The Earl of Selborne.*) (No. 128.)

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS AND GUARDIANS (TERM OF OFFICE) BILL.

Brought from the Commons. Read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 129.)

MINES (PROHIBITION OF CHILD LABOUR UNDERGROUND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Friday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 130.)

COUNTY COUNCILS (ELECTIONS) ACT (1891) AMENDMENT BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

LUNACY REGULATION (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee with a further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 131.)

VOLUNTEERS BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee with an Amendment; and re-committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 132.)

MILITARY LANDS BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 133.)

ANCIENT MONUMENTS PROTECTION BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 134.)

RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

SECONDARY EDUCATION BILL.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): My Lords, before I endeavour to explain the provisions of the Bill which I shall ask leave to introduce, it may be desirable that I should say something on the subject of the steps that have been taken under the Board of Education Bill which was passed last year, in order that the House may see under what central organisation the local authorities proposed to be constituted by this Bill will have to act. The main object of the Board of Education Bill was to unite in one office the two Educational Departments which previously existed under the names of the Education Office and the Science and Art Department, and at the same time to bring under the administration of the newly-constituted board some of the duties which had hitherto been discharged by the Charity Commissioners and, to a minor degree, some of the duties of the Board of Agriculture. Last year I said that a Departmental Committee had been appointed to inquire into the changes in the staff and organisation of the Education and Science and Art Departments which would be necessary in order to establish closer relations between them. That Committee consisted of Sir H. Walpole, chairman, Sir G. Kekewich, Sir W. Abney, Mr. S. Spring-Rice and Mr. Tucker, and Mr. Fearon, secretary of the Charity Commission, was subsequently added. It will not be necessary for me, I think, to refer in detail to any of the recommendations of that Committee. Their labours have been of great value, and I am greatly indebted to them for the thorough examination they have made into all the arrangements of the Departments and for the labour which they have bestowed in making their inquiries. Many of their recommendations have been, or are being, carried into effect, and I have no doubt that they will greatly tend to simplify the work and increase the efficiency of the administration of the office. There was one point, however, which could not be relegated to any Committee, however ably constituted. Your Lordships may remember that on the Bill of last year some discussion took place upon the future organisation of the Education Department. I thought at the time, and I am still more strongly of opinion now, that that discussion was somewhat premature. It proceeded on the assumption that the organisation of the new office would continue on the same lines as those which had existed when the educational Departments were separate and distinct, and that there would be in the new office two divisions, one of which would correspond with and carry on the work of the old Education Office in connection with elementary education, and the other of which would carry on the work of the Science and Art Department. An apprehension, perhaps not altogether unreasonable, was felt on the part of the secondary schools and those responsible for their management that the new powers which were conferred by the Act upon the Board of Education would be simply transferred to one or other of these divisions, and that they would be administered in accordance with the traditions which had for many years grown up and become established in both Departments. It was urged that a third division should be constituted to which the administration of secondary schools, so far as they came under the control of the new board, should be entrusted. I gave at that time an undertaking that, in framing the organisation of the new Department, I would have in view a triple rather than a dual division. I have said that I considered that the discussion was somewhat premature, and I have also to acknowledge that I think the undertaking or understanding which I then indicated was somewhat imprudent on my part. At all events, I have not been able to adhere to it literally, but I have endeavoured to adhere to it in spirit. That I intended to adhere to it literally is proved by the fact that, in the supplementary instructions given to the Committee, they were expressly directed to have regard to the undertaking of the Government to establish a third branch of the Education Office to deal with secondary education. In order to explain the reasons which have induced me to modify my views on this subject I must refer shortly to the relations which have hitherto existed between the old Education Department and the secondary schools and those which might be expected to grow up under the Act, and consider the nature of the work which could with advantage be transferred to the third division. The training colleges which have been subsidised and administered by the Education Department are in the nature of secondary schools, and it is quite possible that in time, when the unification of offices has been brought nearer completion, it may be possible to recognise them as secondary schools, and to regard their administration as a portion of secondary educational work. The training colleges are so closely connected with elementary schools that their administration must, for the present, remain as it is, and no change in respect to that administration can be carried out without a great deal of further consideration. Then, again, the high grade elementary schools which have been established by many school boards give an instruction which in many respects differs very little from secondary instruction. Some day it may be possible to draw a line of demarcation, which does not exist at present, between that education which is recognised as elementary, which is aided as elementary education by the State, and which may legitimately be provided by school boards or Voluntary school managers, and that recognised as secondary, which ought to be administered by other local authorities than school boards. A step has been taken towards drawing that line of demarcation by a Minute recently issued establishing higher elementary schools. But a great deal remains to be done before this line can be definitely drawn; and while many may be of opinion that the school boards have, in a great many cases, trespassed too far on the domain of secondary education, and while the Department may be considered to have been too lax in permitting such trespasses, there are, it must be admitted, great excuses for such encroachment, owing to the fact that the Legislature has never, up to the present time, provided anything in the nature of local secondary education authorities, and that school board work has been a work which could, in the present state of the law, not be done by anyone else. This is a deficiency which I hope the Bill I now ask leave to introduce may to some extent remedy. But until some such measure is passed, and the line I have referred to has been definitely drawn, it would be extremely inexpedient to attempt to place school boards under dual administration in respect of elementary work and that part of it which may more properly be considered to be of a secondary character. These to which I have referred are forms of secondary education with which the old Education Department has been connected, and in my opinion it would be undesirable, if it were not impossible, that the connection between the Elementary branch of the

Office and these forms of education should be summarily severed. There are, however, other forms of secondary education with which the Science and Art Department has already established relations. By a scheme of examination and a grant depending on those examinations, it has influenced the course of education in a large number of secondary schools, it has also established more direct relations, not only with detached classes and courses of lectures, but with schools which, under the name of schools of science, have been subsidised, or in many cases almost wholly maintained, by grants from the Science and Art Department. The most important work in respect of secondary education which may at present devolve on the Board will be the development of these schools of science. They are institutions which have been founded under the guidance and with the assistance of the late Science and Art Department. They have been founded by county councils, or, in large towns, by borough councils. Or, again, they are in many cases endowed schools existing under schemes of the Charity Commissioners, the governing bodies of which have brought their schools into connection with, and have been receiving subsidies from, the Science and Art Department. The relations between these schools and the scientific experts of the late Science and Art Department cannot be broken off, and must remain practically under the administration of the same persons, although, perhaps, under a somewhat different organisation. My Lords, I have given a brief, but, I am afraid, imperfect statement of the existing relations between the Education Department and secondary schools. The Act of last year, however, provides for the extension of those relations. It provides for the eventual transfer to the Board of Education of all the powers of the Charity Commission. It has been considered expedient, however, that this transfer should be gradual and tentative. The Order in Council now on the Table of the House is the first instalment of such transfer. The terms of that Order are necessarily extremely technical, and I do not know that it is necessary that I should attempt on this occasion to explain them in detail. I may say, however, that the first clause applies to England and Wales generally, and enables the Education Board to exercise, concurrently with the Charity Commissioners, their powers of administration and inspection. That is a power which it was necessary the Board of Education should have, to enable them to make complete and effectual the educational inspection of such schools as might desire to place themselves in connection with the Board. The second clause makes a more complete transfer. It transfers, with certain exceptions, the powers at present exercised by the Charity Commissioners with regard to educational endowments regulated by schemes within the area of Wales and Monmouthshire. This is an area in which jurisdiction over educational endowments could be easily transferred without prejudice to continued temporary jurisdiction over similar endowments in England. Owing to the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, Wales already possesses a local organisation for secondary education, with whom the central authority will at once enter into relations, whereas in England such bodies have still to be created; and the experience gained by the Board in dealing with a limited area would prepare it for exercising similar powers throughout the country. The result of this review of the work, present and prospective, of the Board of Education in connection with secondary education was to convince us that little could be transferred from the control of the officials now engaged in its administration to a third division. The duties of such a division would in the main be limited to the new work which would devolve on the Board under the Act of last year. It appeared to be scarcely worth while to create a new division solely for the purpose of work taken over from the Charity Commissioners, or for inspection of older secondary schools wishing to bring themselves into connection with the Board and submit to its examinations. It is probable that the great majority of these desire to enter into such connection on account of the impulse which may thereby be given to the newer order of studies, and the division charged with their inspection would have to rely mainly on the assistance of the scientific experts who would be connected with the other divisions of the Department. At the same time the schoolmasters and those who are engaged in the management of secondary schools appear to some extent to have modified their own views. Not very long ago I received an important deputation in which the University of Oxford, the Headmasters' Conference, and the Headmasters' Association were represented, and their object was to urge that in the organisation of the office no hard-and-fast line ought to be drawn between the literary and scientific sides of instruction and the inspection of literary and scientific instruction. They did not, I admit, altogether abandon the position which was taken up by the school authorities last year, but they appeared to be conscious that the representations they were then putting forward were not altogether consistent with the position they had taken up last year. The deputation also strongly urged that a separation should be made between what is termed technology and literary or scientific instruction. This view is one which is also strongly held by those who have been chiefly associated in the promotion of technological study. The City and Guilds of London Institute, for instance, have urged upon the Department that the distinctive difference between the teaching of science as a part of general education and the teaching of science in its application to special industries ought to be recognised, and that the office ought to be arranged with this distinction in view. For the reasons which I have endeavoured to indicate, we now propose to revert to a dual organisation of the office, but not entirely upon the lines of the late Education and Science and Art Departments. The principal officers of the Department which we propose will be a principal permanent secretary, who will supervise generally the whole work of the Department. It must be remembered, when special importance is attached to this or that minor subordinate appointment, that it will be the permanent secretary who will be responsible to the President of the Board for the administration of the whole Department, and that it is impossible, and would be undesirable even if it were possible, that the office should be divided into what I may call water-tight compartments, the head of each of which would be charged with special duties and no other, and that the idea should be entertained that the work of the office should be carried on in separate departments, which should have no connection or relation with each other. We propose that under the principal permanent secretary there shall be two principal assistant secretaries—one mainly charged with duties in connection with elementary, and the other with secondary, education. We propose to abolish the name "Science and Art Department." The Science and Art Department will be merged in the secondary education branch of the office. As soon as it may be possible we propose to transfer the greater part of the staff of the late Science and Art Department from South Kensington to Whitehall, except such part of it as it may be necessary to leave at South Kensington for the administration of the museum and the colleges of science and art. In place of the third division that was contemplated, we now propose to give the principal assistant secretary of secondary education two additional assistant secretaries, one of whom will be chiefly charged with the supervision and control of literary instruction, and the other of technological study. This is not the organisation, I admit, to which I partly committed myself last year; but I trust that it may, in substance, meet the views, especially the later views, which have been expressed to me by high educational authorities. With the name we hope to get rid of many of the traditions which were supposed to attach to the old Science and Art Department—traditions which have, I believe, been regarded as opposed to the true interests of education by many of those who have been responsible for the management of the older endowed schools. The original idea of the Science and Art Department was, or at all events was supposed to be, that by means of lectures, classes, and examinations a knowledge of the principles of science and art, which would be valuable to the students themselves and to the nation at large, could be engrafted upon almost any kind of previous elementary or secondary training. It is quite true that this idea has been in recent years very largely modified, but I do not think that it is yet generally known how far the original traditions of the Science and Art Department have been already departed from. We hope and intend that the idea of the future education branch of the office will be to make science and art instruction a part of general education in addition to those classical and literary studies which have hitherto formed its main portion. In the schools and institutions directly assisted by the Board of Education the teaching of science and of art, with the addition, perhaps, of some commercial subjects, will probably remain the principal object. But, on the other hand, in those secondary schools, whether of older or more modern type, which desire to enter into connection with the Board there ought not to be, and there need not be, any interference with the older classical and literary studies so long as there continues to be a demand for them. At the same time, we hope that the scientific resources of the Board will be placed at their disposal if they desire, as many of them do desire, to develop the more modern sides of instruction and education. If I may put the case in another way, I conceive that the apprehension that was felt and given expression to last year was that the tendency to interference by the Education Department with secondary teaching would be in the direction of substituting scientific for classical studies, and next that scientific studies would only be regarded from the point of view of their commercial value. As I have said, it probably will be the case that any interposition of the Board in regard to secondary education will be in the direction of endeavouring to substitute more modern for the older studies, but it ought not to be difficult to find administrators of sufficiently wide knowledge and experience to make the latter result impossible. In connection with this point it may be of interest to the House to know what are the principal appointments which have been made or are proposed to be made in the principal office of the new secondary education branch of the department. Sir George Kekewich, the late secretary of the Board of Education, has become the permanent principal secretary of the new Board, and it is he who will be responsible to the President of the Board and to the Government for the administration of the Department as a whole. The principal assistant secretary for secondary education will be Sir William Abney, who has done more than any other man in extending the studies of the schools of science under the Science and Art Department. Under him the assistant secretary, who will be chiefly concerned with the literary side of instruction, will be Mr. Bruce, an Assistant Commissioner to the Charity Commission under the Endowed Schools Act, who has been chiefly engaged and has obtained much experience in the administration of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act. The assistant secretary for technological study has not yet been appointed. I come now to a brief statement of the objects of the Bill which I am asking leave to introduce. I will defer any explanation of detail until the text of the Bill is before your Lordships; but the Bill is based on foundations that already exist, and indeed it contains very little beyond the proposals which were contained in the Bill of 1896, so far as that Bill related to secondary education. Local authorities already exist under the Technical Instruction Act of 1889 and the Local Taxation Act of 1890, with limited powers of aiding and supervising technical and manual instruction as a part of secondary education. Those authorities are county councils, county borough councils, the councils of non-county boroughs, and urban district councils. The resources which they possess are the proceeds of a penny rate and a sum derived from the local taxation account, which now amounts to over £800,000 a year. The county councils and the county boroughs are alone the recipients of the sums derived from the local taxation fund. The Bill proposes to extend these existing foundations. In the first place it will make the application of the local taxation money to educational purposes compulsory instead of optional, as it is at present. It will enable the authority to apply both that fund and the rates to the purposes of secondary education generally, not limited to technical or manual instruction. It will, however, require that this shall only be done after adequate provision has been made for technical instruction; and in order not to bring about any sudden change or disruption in the work that has already been going on the authorities will be instructed to have regard to the existing application of the funds to educational purposes. It has been necessary to decide to what authorities acting in what areas the extended powers are to be given. We propose to follow the precedent of the Local Taxation Act, 1890, of the Bill of 1896, and the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education, and to entrust these extended powers to county councils and county borough councils, only leaving to the minor authorities the powers which they already enjoy under the Technical Instruction Act. There is nothing in this provision that will prevent the constitution of authorities for other areas, either greater or smaller, if they should be found to be more convenient for educational purposes. The Bill proposes to constitute the education committees which already exist upon a more formal and recognised basis. Suggestions have been made that provision ought to be made in the Bill for the representation on these educational committees of the councils of non-county boroughs and of urban districts, and that the Bill should contain provisions for the representation on the education committees of school boards or other educational interests within the area. We consider, however, that the circumstances of the different districts in the country are so various that to include any provisions of this kind in the Bill which would be applicable alike to all parts of the country would be impracticable, and we thought the difficulty might be better solved by providing that these education committees shall be framed by schemes to be submitted to and approved by the Board of Education. The schemes may provide for the constitution of joint committees for areas in more than one county or county borough; or, on the other hand, by the words which are inserted in the Bill "or any part thereof" it is intended to indicate that either by means of sub-committees or otherwise provisions may be made for the management of any smaller area than that of a county or county borough. Under the existing law county councils and urban authorities have each the power to levy a penny rate, and it follows that in some districts which are subject to each authority a rate of twopence may at present be levied for the purposes of technical instruction. The Bill will propose to raise the rating limit to twopence in all cases, but in no case shall the rate levied by the county and by the local authority combined exceed that amount. In the discussion on the Board of Education Bill last year the denominational question was not altogether excluded. It did not, however, I am happy to say, in relation to that Bill give rise to any very serious difficulty. I wish that might also be the case in regard to the present Bill, but such questions cannot be avoided by simply ignoring them, and we consider it necessary to state clearly in what way these difficulties may arise and how it is proposed to meet them. The Technical Instruction Act of 1889 contains certain instructions on the grants in aid to denominational institutions. The first of these was in the nature of a conscience clause. That appears to be perfectly reasonable, and has been maintained in the present Bill. The second was a provision of a rather remarkable character. I have never been able—the debate having been very imperfectly reported—to ascertain how it came to be introduced, nor what was its precise object. The provision was—

> "No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught at any school aided out of the local rate to a scholar attending only for the purposes of technical or manual instruction under this Act, and the times for prayer or religious worship, or for any lesson or series of lessons on a religious subject, shall be conveniently arranged for the purpose of allowing the withdrawal of such scholar therefrom."

It will be seen that it is a kind of Cowper-Temple provision. But the Cowper-Temple clause applies to schools, while this applies to scholars. It appears to contemplate the existence of classes for purposes of technical or manual instruction only, which might be attached to certain denominational schools apart from the ordinary course of instruction in that school. The provision might be suitable in the case of such classes, but is manifestly inapplicable to the case of aid given by a public authority to secondary instruction in general. So far as I have ascertained, the provision has had very little effect in restricting the range of aid given by local authorities to denominational schools. The retention of this clause would, however, obviously be objected to as unduly limiting the discretion of the local authority in the choice of schools, the schools of a denominational character being in many cases the only institutions of the kind which it is possible for the local authority to aid. A fair objection might also be taken to it as creating invidious objections between those numerous secondary schools which in some form give religious instruction and those comparatively few schools which give no religious instruction at all. To apply this provision without amendment to the present Bill would have the effect of making absolute nonsense of the provision. It would read, with the necessary correction—

> "No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught at any school aided out of the local rate to a scholar attending only for the purposes of secondary general education."

For what other purpose could a scholar attend these schools? Under the circumstances, and having regard to the very small effect which the clause has hitherto had, having been, as we suppose, in some way or another evaded by those whom its action was intended to restrain, we propose, while leaving the provision in force in the Technical Instruction Act, to replace it as regards the present Bill by a provision simply prohibiting aid to any school in respect of the religious instruction given therein. I will defer any further statement with respect to this Bill to another stage. I have, of course, at this advanced stage of the session very little hope that a Bill which may raise a considerable amount of controversy can pass into law in the present session. For one reason I regret this, because I think it is extremely desirable that as soon as possible the line of demarcation to which I have referred between elementary and secondary education should be drawn, and it should be understood what is the character of the education which the school boards can legitimately provide, and of that which ought to be provided by other local authorities. On the other hand, we have found considerable advantage from discussion in the country on the Bill which I introduced the year before last, and I hope that a similar result may follow if this Bill is not passed in the present session. At all events, I hope we shall have some discussion in this House, and I propose, therefore, as soon as may be, to move its Second Reading. I hope it may be convenient to do so within a week or ten days; but, of course, in the matter of time I shall be glad to consult the convenience of your Lordships. I have now only to ask leave to introduce the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be read a first time."—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I think it would be far better to postpone any serious discussion of the Bill until we have it in our hands. It is only fair to the noble Duke, however, to say that I think the arrangement of offices, as far as I can understand the matter, is a very great improvement on the plan which he laid before us last year. With regard to the provisions of the Bill, I should not like to express any opinion at present. I do not at all mean by that to express, in a side way, any unfavourable opinion. The matter is one of great importance, and I think we should have time to consider all the clauses of the Bill. I should suggest to the noble Duke that ten days or a fortnight would not be too long to give your Lordships for an examination of the Bill.

Bill to make better provision for enabling county councils and other local authorities to aid forms of education not being elementary—presented by the Lord President (*D. Devonshire*); read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 135.)

BURIAL GROUNDS BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD BELPER: The subject of the Bill which I have to ask your Lordships to read a second time this evening is one that has constantly attracted the attention of Parliament. The laws which govern the use of burial grounds are of a very complex nature; they are contained in a series of Acts of Parliament called the Burial Acts, which are administered under the supervision of the Home Office. The matter is rendered still more complicated by the fact that there is another Act, called the Public Health (Interments) Act, 1879, which is administered by the Local Government Board. The difficulties with regard to the present law relating to burial grounds do not by any means end here. It is a notorious fact that the present state of the law has given rise to constant disputes and difficulties. How great those difficulties are has been shown by the fact that many parties have attempted to come to a compromise outside the provisions of the Acts in order to make an arrangement which would be more satisfactory. It is not surprising, therefore, that the attention of Parliament has been constantly called to the present state of affairs, and three years ago a suggestion was made in the House of Commons that a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into the whole state of the law under the Burial

Acts. That suggestion was accepted by the Government, and a Select Committee was appointed to inquire whether any alteration in the existing law was necessary, especially in regard to the consecration of ground, the provision of chapels, and the allocation of fees. The Committee was composed of gentlemen fairly representative, I think I may say, of the different sides of this very difficult question. It had the great advantage of being presided over by the Member for the University of Cambridge, Sir Richard Jebb, and I think it will be at once admitted that both the chairman and the other members of the Committee approached the matter in a very conciliatory spirit, and with an earnest desire to arrive at some fair and satisfactory compromise, for they came to what was practically a unanimous conclusion on the question. Their Report was made at the end of the session of 1898, after the Committee had taken a great deal of evidence with respect to the state of the law and the difficulties which had arisen under it. Last session a deputation waited upon the Home Secretary, consisting of representatives of both sides of the question, and requested him to bring in a Bill to carry out the recommendations of that Report. That Bill has been brought in this year by the Home Secretary. It is practically founded on all the suggestions made by the Select Committee, with two exceptions, which I will presently notice. The subsequent course of that Bill through the other House justified the arrangement that had been come to by the Committee, because it may be said to have met with the general assent of that House, and to have been passed through without any substantial amendment. That is the history of the Bill so far as it has got. With regard to the necessity for some amendment of the law, I think it is unnecessary for me to give any opinion of my own. I cannot put the case in favour of legislation more strongly than it is put by the Committee in almost the first paragraph of their Report. I will therefore venture to quote those few words to the House, because I think they express very clearly what is the feeling in the country generally upon the subject. The Committee say—

> "Your Committee are of opinion that these laws are unduly complex, that some of their provisions are unjust, the machinery by which they are administered cumbrous and defective, and their operation has been, and still is, a frequent cause of controversy fraught with deplorable consequences to the peace of the localities concerned."

I do not think it would be possible to put more strongly and concisely the defects in the provisions of these Acts, and those views are clearly shared by a number of people who have had experience in the working of the Acts. I should like to make it clear that this Bill deals only with burial grounds under the Burial Acts and the Public Health (Interments) Act. It does not affect churchyards in any way, nor does it refer in the slightest degree to cemeteries owned by companies and established under private Acts. The three most important questions with which it deals are those which were specially referred to the Committee, and which have no doubt caused the most friction in the administration of the law—namely, the consecration of burial grounds, the provision of chapels, and the fees which are payable to the different authorities. I will state as briefly as I can the effect of the provisions of this Bill, which carries out the recommendations of the Committee. With regard to consecration, the proposal which the Committee made, and which is carried out in this Bill, is that every local authority should have discretionary power to apply for the consecration of part of the cemetery, but if the local authority for any reason decline to, or do not, apply for the consecration of part of the cemetery, and a demand for consecrated ground is proved to be made by a reasonable number of parishioners, then the Secretary of State has power to intervene and himself apply for consecration. As to the second point to which I alluded—the provision of chapels—the Committee recommended that in every cemetery the chapel or chapels which may be erected at the cost of the ratepayers should be unconsecrated and open to all, and, in addition to that, that a religious body, if they obtained the consent of the local authority, should have power to erect at their own cost a chapel for services according to the rites of their own body. If the local authority refuses its consent, then the Bill proposes that the Secretary of State might, if he thought fit, require the burial authority to erect or furnish or maintain such a chapel, or give the necessary facilities.

The third point deals with the fees which should be paid, and under this head there is a clause of considerable length. I will not trouble your Lordships by stating all the details of the clause; but, generally speaking, the proposal is that in the future all ecclesiastical fees other than fees for services actually rendered should be abolished in cemeteries which are hereafter to be provided by the local authority. The fees that are paid to incumbents already receiving them are continued for either fifteen years or the life of the incumbent, whichever period is the shorter. In addition to that there are regulations which lay down that the fees should be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval, and that in all cases the same amount should be demanded in respect of burial in consecrated as in unconsecrated ground. I do not presume to enter into an elaborate argument in favour of these particular proposals. I prefer to rely upon the fact that these are compromises which have been arranged, after very careful consideration, by representatives of both sides who have had full opportunity of knowing what the difficulties of the case are, and that they have been accepted, generally speaking, by both sides as a fair and reasonable arrangement. There are two other points I should like briefly to refer to. There was one recommendation in the Report of the Committee to the effect that the confusion which was caused by the two central authorities—the Local Government Board and the Home Office—should be done away with, and that in future all these matters should be submitted to the Local Government Board. The Bill does not propose to carry out that recommendation precisely. What it proposes is that all those matters which concern finance, sanitary regulations, and questions of that sort, should be transferred from the Home Office to the Local Government Board, but that the Home Office should retain the management of what may be called ecclesiastical matters, such as the consecration of ground and the fees which are paid for ecclesiastical purposes. The Committee strongly recommend that in addition to an amendment of the law the Burial Acts should be consolidated, and anyone who has had the misfortune to have to study those Acts will agree that it would be very desirable that consolidation should take place. The Home Secretary, however, felt that if he introduced consolidation into a Bill which was proposing to make an important amendment in the law, it might place difficulties in the way of the passing of the Bill; but that if the Bill passed in its present form, it would pave the way for another Bill to consolidate the Burial Acts. The Home Secretary hopes, as we all do, that consolidation may take place, but it will be better done after this amendment of the law has been carried out. I hope I have said enough to induce your Lordships to give a favourable consideration to the Bill, and to allow it to be read a second time. I know that this is a subject in which a great many of your Lordships take a deep interest, and it is quite possible that there may be some individual Members of your Lordships' House who may not think that the particular proposals in the Bill are ideally the best. I will only ask them to recognise that this Bill is a compromise which has been arranged, as I have said, by a Committee representing both sides of the question, that the settlement arrived at has been accepted by the Government and endorsed by the other House of Parliament, and that if the Bill can pass into law in substantially the same form as it now assumes, there is every hope that those unhappy disputes and differences which have too frequently occurred, and which are especially painful when they take place at the side of the open grave, may in the future cease and harmony reign in their stead.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Belper.*)

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I think the Government are very much to be congratulated on having succeeded in producing a Bill which certainly satisfies the great majority of those who are interested in the matter. I think this is a very fair and reasonable attempt to settle what is a very difficult matter; and though, of course, there will be difference of opinion here and there, I doubt very much indeed whether it would be possible to make a better arrangement than that which is put before us in this Bill. I shall probably place an Amendment on the Paper when the Bill gets into Committee, but my Amendment will not touch the principle of the Bill in the slightest degree. With the Bill, as a whole, I am entirely in agreement.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: I should like to add my congratulations to those of my brother Archbishop, and to especially compliment the Committee upon the successful issue to which they have brought their deliberations. No one who is familiar with the Burial Acts can doubt that there is an immediate necessity for some amendment. It used to be said that there was only one man in England who could understand the Burial Acts, and that he did not, owing to their being so extremely complicated. I think the Committee have arrived at a compromise which will satisfy all the persons concerned, and I can say, on behalf of those who sit on this Bench, that no hindrance will be offered to the passing of the Bill.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER: My Lords, it seems to me desirable that we should, especially, perhaps, from this Bench, bear testimony to our sense of the spirit in which this matter has been approached by those who do not ordinarily approve of our ecclesiastical system, and who might, perhaps, be regarded as our opponents in a matter of this kind. To all of us who have followed this controversy, it will be at once apparent that there has been a genuine desire to arrive at a peaceful and harmonious settlement of the question. There are always some people who endeavour to keep a grievance open for the sake of its usefulness to the cause to which they belong, but there has, so far as I can see, been no such endeavour in this case. The difficulties were acute rather than widespread; but they were certainly real, and this Bill is a genuine and satisfactory endeavour to grapple with them.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): This Bill seems to me to be drawn with so little care that I shall not undertake the responsibility of trying to amend it. For instance, Clause 2 says that:—

> "'usual place of abode' shall mean any ordinary residence of the person referred to, whether he has more than one or not, or his usual abode for fifteen days immediately preceding his making an affidavit to lead a licence."

What is the difference between those two things? What is the object of such an interpretation as that? This is only one example of a good many more to which I shall have to allude. What I particularly want to call attention to is that having made a definition of that sort it is not followed in the course of the Bill. The words "dwelling place" are used throughout the Bill without reference to the definition clause. In my opinion the whole Bill ought to be redrafted with more care.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I would point out to the noble and learned Lord that this Bill was before the House years ago. It was very considerably amended, and then went down to the House of Commons. The Bill which I have introduced this year is verbatim the same Bill as that which passed the House on the last occasion. Therefore, if it is so very badly drafted the responsibility surely rests with the House of Lords. When I proposed to bring in the Bill again this year I gave instructions that the measure, as it passed the House before, should be precisely followed, and I cannot find any instance in which my instructions have not been fully carried out. I do not profess to be a draughtsman of Bills, but I think I was justified in supposing that if the Bill had passed through your Lordships' House in this form it would not be necessary for me to look any further to the drafting. Of course, it is quite possible that this House may have been a little somnolent on the former occasion, but at that time the Bill was discussed very fully indeed. As a matter of fact, the noble and learned Lord himself took part in the discussion and supported the Bill. I will hand him the Bill and he can see for himself. It left this House on 12th May, 1891, and was printed in the House of Commons on 1st June of the same year. There has been no change made in the Bill since then. I do not quite understand the objection which the Lord Chancellor has now raised to something in Clause 2, but I should be very glad to accept an Amendment, either here or in the Standing Committee, if his Lordship thinks the clause can be easily amended.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 :—

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I cannot help thinking that anyone who reads this clause would do the most rev. Prelate the injustice of supposing that he wanted to obtain power to alter the form of solemnisation of marriage. The clause reads—

> "The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, with the consent of the Convocations, are hereby authorised, subject to the approval of Her Majesty the Queen, to make such alterations in the rubrics after the Nicene Creed and in the form of solemnisation of matrimony as will make them agree with this Act."

I do not believe that the most rev. Prelate really wishes to alter the form of solemnisation of matrimony. What he desires would be obtained by inserting, after the words "Nicene Creed," "and in the rubrics in the form of solemnisation of matrimony." This is an illustration of the loose drafting I refer to. I really do not remember what happened nine years ago, and under what circumstances my attention was not called to the matter. I do not think we are committed to the Bill as it stands by the fact of having been in a somnolent state when it last passed. We now have the facts before us, and must deal with them as they are.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I shall be most willing to agree to any amendment of the kind referred to which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack may move in Standing Committee.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: This clause raises a serious question of principle in respect to the publication of the place of marriage. Under Lord Hardwicke's Act there is a positive prohibition against a marriage being celebrated in any church other than that in which the banns have been published. It is now proposed to alter this. Since the Second Reading of the Bill, when I ventured to make a few observations on this point, my attention has been called by more than one communication to this provision of the Bill, and the serious and unfortunate consequences that might have arisen had this been the law under the Act of 1823. The clause provides that the marriage may be solemnised in any church in the diocese where the banns are published. This will tend to make the place of marriage a secret, and is an alteration in the existing law for which no necessity has been shown. The parties must make up their minds where their banns are to be published. Then why cannot they make up their minds where the marriage is to be celebrated? What is the evil to be got rid of? The right rev. Prelate said the present law might be inconvenient, but I should like him to give your Lordships a concrete case in which inconvenience may arise. It appears to me that this is a most serious departure from the code of law which has existed ever since Lord Hardwicke's time, and has been found most useful in correcting what were most serious abuses. I am afraid I must ask your Lordships to express an opinion upon it one way or the other, unless a better reason than I have yet heard is given for altering the law.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: One of the great purposes of the Bill is to facilitate marriages in churches as compared with marriages at registrars' offices. The latter are now practically quite secret. The notice which has to be exhibited in lieu of banns is put up in the office in such a way that a person must go on purpose to the place to find that the notice is there. The notice is generally placed upon a door in such a manner as not to be easily seen, and a man who wants to find out whether a marriage has been notified in the usual way has to find out that it is likely to be notified and then to go to the office to see if it has been. This procedure at the registry office has already very considerably diminished the publicity that should attend marriages, and people resort to the office instead of attending church. I think this is a very great mischief, and I desire to remove every obstacle to marriage in church. This is the object of the clause. The clause provides that the banns shall continue to be published as they are at present, but that the persons who hand them in to be published shall always state where they intend to seek for the actual marriage, and in what church it is to be solemnised. The clause further provides that—

> "The marriage shall not be solemnised in any church wherein the banns have not been published without the consent of the minister thereof, nor until after the production to him of a certificate of due publication of the banns at each of the churches where they were published, and that they were not forbidden by any person having a right to stop the marriage, and that an entry was made in the banns book of the intention to solemnise the marriage in such church."

I should be quite willing, if it would satisfy my noble and learned friend, to add a proviso that at the publication of the banns the name of the church where the marriage is to be solemnised should be mentioned. A large number of the artisan class particularly complain very much that they cannot be married without having all their acquaintances about them, who make a kind of mob at the marriage. Besides this, there are demands upon them for a wedding breakfast, and the consequence is that they are desirous of getting away from their friends and being married at some convenient distance, but at a distance which will be too far away for their acquaintances to follow them. The fact that they have to do this makes them prefer to go to the registrar's office, where they can contrive to have the marriage entirely in secrecy. This Bill will really ensure greater publicity for the marriage ceremony than attends marriages in a registrar's office. I will insert words, as I have said, providing that on the publication of the banns the name of the church where the marriage is to take place shall be mentioned, and I trust that will satisfy the Lord Chancellor. I do not think the clause, as amended, will be quite as good, but it will be tolerably good.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS: My Lords, I think this clause will have the effect of getting rid of what I may call fictitious residence. London clergymen are constantly faced with the difficulty that people wish to be married in their church who are not living in the parish. They therefore leave an empty carpet bag in some room in the parish for fifteen days, and that is called a residence. It would be much better if people desiring to be married in a particular church should be able to do so without this sort of humbug. The thing should be straightforward. Where banns are published in a registrar's office the marriage may still take place in a church, and therefore under the present law it is not always necessary for the marriage to take place where the banns are published.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: This is the first time I have heard a wedding party described as a mob from whom the bride and bridegroom were endeavouring to escape. The most rev. prelate complains that the notices are exhibited in the registrars' offices in such a way that they easily pass unnoticed, but it is an odd way to remedy that by increasing the secrecy of marriages by this sort of provision. If there is anything wrong in the manner in which banns are published in a registrar's office, let it be amended, but what relevancy has that to the question now under discussion? I have asked the most rev. prelate for some concrete case showing the particular inconvenience which it is desired to remove, but he gave me nothing except the grotesque account of people who wish to escape from their neighbours and friends on the ground that the latter would expect them to provide a breakfast. I shall insist upon my Amendment to omit the clause.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER: With all respect to the noble and learned Lord Chancellor, I venture to deny that marriages under this Bill will, as the noble and learned Lord supposes, be attended by greater secrecy. On the contrary, so far as there is any difference at all, the effect will be to ensure greater publicity. We will suppose that two people desire to be married, and that the father of the bride wishes to prevent the marriage. I want to know how that will be rendered easier for him because the marriage takes place in one of the two churches in which the banns have been published than it would be in the third church, the name of which had been announced when the banns were published? If the noble and learned Lord could show that the suggested provision would lead to additional secrecy I should be entirely with him in objecting to it, but I fail to see how such can be the case.

It is very desirable to get rid of the mischievous sham fictitious "residence," to which the Bishop of St. Albans has referred, and it is with a view to the promotion of openness and straightforwardness that this clause has been drafted.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Will the most rev. Prelate tell the House whether he intends to move the Amendment he indicated in the course of his remarks? I think it would be better if the clause were amended before it is proposed to strike it out altogether.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I confess I thought my Amendment would have satisfied the noble and learned Lord. I am quite prepared to move it.

Moved—

"In Clause 6, page 2, line 26, after 'published' to insert 'provided that at the publication of the banns the name of such church is mentioned.'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

LORD GLENESK: My Lords, I venture to think that already in England marriage is more easy than in any other country, and the proposal in the Bill will tend to give additional facilities for parties going away from their friends to get married. This is exactly one of the things which promotes bigamy in England. I would like to know how many working men have two wives, and think nothing of it. In other countries people cannot get married without the consent of their parents until they are forty years of age. I know a case in which an actor and actress, Jewess and Greek, wished to get married, and the Roman Catholic law in France would not allow them to do so without the consent of their parents, as they were under forty years of age. They therefore decided to come over to England.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Very wise of them.

LORD GLENESK: They wrote to a solicitor in this country, asking him to make arrangements for getting them married on arrival. The solicitor replied that it was impossible, and the lady then telegraphed to him to see me, saying she knew Sir Algernon (as I then was) could arrange anything, and would get the sheriff to come to the railway station and marry them on arrival. The couple came to England, and what was my astonishment on being told when I met them that they had been married that morning. On inquiry I found that the marriage had been solemnised in one of the highest churches in London by means of a licence obtained from a predecessor of the most rev. Prelate, on the representation that the man had been in England for three weeks. In view of circumstances such as these I cannot support the clause.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: So far as I can see, the very interesting story told by the noble Lord does not bear on the Bill. He is desirous that we should have the French law of marriage introduced into this country.

LORD GLENESK: No.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: He wants the consent of the parents and all kinds of things to be obtained, but what has that to do with this Bill? If it goes to a division I shall vote with the right rev. Bench on this matter, because I cannot see that, after the Amendment which the most rev. Prelate has proposed is made, there can be any possible chance of due publicity not being given, and if due publicity is given I do not see why this facility should not be afforded to those tormented persons referred to who wish to run away from their friends.

THE LORD BISHOP OF CHICHESTER: In rising to support this clause I would point out that the publication of banns in the various churches will be carried out under this Bill in exactly the same way as at present. The only question is, whether it is absolutely necessary to continue the present law by which the marriage must take place in one of the churches in which the banns have been published. A case arose only recently in my own diocese where the inconvenience of the present law was made manifest. Two members of the choir in one parish, who were living in other parishes, desired to get married. They were, of course, compelled to have the banns published in the parishes in which they lived, but they wished to be married in the church of whose choir they were members. And why should they not? There would be perfect publicity, because the name of the church in which they were to be married would be mentioned when the banns were published. I cannot see any objection to the clause.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

On Question, "That Clause 6 stand part of the Bill," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 29; Not Contents, 18.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.
Camperdown, E.
Crewe, E.
Grey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Morley, E.
Romney, E.
Spencer, E.
Carlisle, L. Bp.

Chichester, L. Bp.
Durham, L. Bp.
Hereford, L. Bp.
Lichfield, L. Bp.
Lincoln, L. Bp.
Norwich, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
Southwell, L. Bp.
Winchester, L. Bp.
Ashcombe, L.

Burghclere, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Leigh, L.
Monkswell, L. [*Teller.*]
Reay, L. [*Teller.*]
Robertson, L.
St. Levan, L.
Windsor, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)
Cross, V. (*L. Privy Seal.*) [*Teller.*]
Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Denbigh, E.

Mar, E.
Mayo, E.
Waldegrave, E.
Knutsford, V.
Frankfort de Montmorency, V.
Hopetoun, L. (*E. Hopetoun.*) (*L Chamberlain.*)

Belper, L. [*Teller.*]
Churchill, L.
Glenesk, L.
Harris, L.
Heneage, L.
James, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7:—

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I do not intend to divide upon this Clause, but I must protest against it. I very much doubt whether, under the circumstances suggested here, it is very desirable to facilitate the marriages of seamen. One knows what is said in the case of seamen, and in Clause 7 it is provided that a seaman, if his ship is in port, may be married in any church within five miles of the ship. That seems to me to encourage the practice to which the noble Lord opposite objected.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 18 agreed to.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: Upon every one of these clauses I think questions may arise as to the drafting, but, as I have said, it seems to me that the Bill is so extremely ill-drawn that I shall not attempt to amend it. Therefore, those who are in charge of the Bill will take their own responsibility of keeping it as it stands.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 136.)

COUNTY SURVEYORS (IRELAND) BILL.

NAVAL RESERVE (MOBILISATION) BILL.

Read 3^{a} (according to Order), and passed.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—RETURN OF EXPENSES.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I beg to move for a Return showing the total expenses of the Irish Land Commission for each of the five years ended 31st March, 1896, to 1900. The Irish Land Commission exercises a very important part in our lives in Ireland, and also in the lives of our tenants. I know of no public document readily accessible which gives this Return, and therefore I hope there will be no objection to granting it.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing the total expenses of the Irish Land Commission for each of the five years ended 31st March, 1896 to 1900."—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: My Lords, the information which the noble Earl asks for is already given, to a great extent, in the annual Appropriation Account which is presented to Parliament every year, the last of which is to 31st March, 1899. That for 1899–1900 will be presented in due course, but I may tell the noble Lord that the nett expenditure for that year was, approximately, £125,000. There are one or two exceptions, however, in that the salaries of the Chief Commissioners are not shown in the Appropriation Account. They are charged to the Consolidated Fund, and amount to about £14,000. In addition to the amounts shown in the Appropriation Account there are certain items for office accommodation, stationery, printing, etc., the details of which will be found set forth in the annual Estimate for the Land Commission. I think if the noble Earl will look up those documents he will get all the information he requires.

THE EARL OF MAYO: May I ask the noble Earl if those different items might be consolidated? This would give us the Return in a very simple form.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I will inquire of the Irish Office, but the answer I have given to the noble Earl was the answer which I obtained to his question.

THE EARL OF MAYO: The items are all mixed up at present, and if they were consolidated it would save us a great deal of trouble.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I will inquire.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

LUNACY ADMINISTRATION—THE "ST. PANCRAS SCANDAL."

*LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN: My Lords, I rise to call the attention of the House to what the Press has described as the "St. Pancras Scandal"; and to ask the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who has special authority and responsibility in relation to the care of lunatics in this country, whether it is proposed to take any, and what, proceedings in the matter. Looking to the hour which has been reached my observations will be brief. Your Lordships are aware that the parish authorities have very important duties to discharge in relation to lunatics within their parish, and that these functions are discharged largely by two sets of officers paid by the parish, called the relieving officer and the medical officer. Some very startling facts have been brought to light in connection with the administration of the lunacy laws in the parish of St. Pancras which certainly do call for public notice, especially as it appears from the report of the authority itself that the state of things there disclosed has existed for a period of something approaching thirty years. The remarkable facts connected with the case are mainly three: (1) That the number of persons detained as insane in St. Pancras is some 100 per cent. greater than in the adjoining parish of Islington, according to population; (2) that a much greater number of lunatics are sent to private asylums from St. Pancras than from the adjoining parish; and (3) that the cost of the maintenance of insane persons in St. Pancras, which falls, of course, upon the ratepayer, is from 100 to 200 per cent. higher than in the adjoining parish. According to the report issued by the Marylebone Vestry, it appears that the total cost to St. Pancras for the half-year ending Lady-day, 1899, was £14,143 17s. 3d. At Islington the cost was £5,543 17s. 4d.—between a half and a third of the cost in St. Pancras. Further, the report states that in Islington, for the whole six months, only six patients were sent from that parish to expensive private licensed houses at the rate of £2 2s. a week, while twenty-seven were sent from St. Pancras to Hoxton House and thirteen to Bethnal House—namely, forty from St. Pancras as against six from Islington. These facts having been tardily drawn to the attention of the vestry, an inquiry was instituted into the matter, and the report discloses what I am now about to mention. I would remind the House of what the duties and the powers of the relieving officers are. A relieving officer may, on his own responsibility, take up—take into custody practically—a person whom he has reason to believe to be insane and dangerous to the public, and without any medical examination, and without authority from anyone, cause such person to be detained for a period of three days, after which time some step must be taken which involves judicial inquiry before a magistrate and a medical examination. It appears that the relieving officers in St. Pancras have, over the long period I have mentioned, been in the habit of receiving, and receiving regularly, as if it were a right, a sum of about five shillings for each medical examination of a person believed to be insane. That is to say, when a relieving officer produced a patient for the purpose of examination to a medical man, that medical man paid him five shillings and sometimes less. When I remind your Lordships that there may be two or even three of such examinations when the medical officer and the magistrate are not able to arrive at a definite conclusion, your Lordships will see that the fees paid in that way may become considerable. Next, the report ascertains the fact that the medical men who were honourable and high-minded enough to decline to pay these douceurs to the relieving officer for doing that which was merely his duty were, as it were, boycotted by the relieving officer, and persons supposed to be insane were not brought to them for examination. Lastly, the report finds that relieving officers, on taking patients to private asylums, are paid varying fees by the owners of those private asylums — fees varying from 10s. to £1 and sometimes as much as £2. The figures of those detained do not exhaust the working of this corrupt system, because it does not follow that every person who is taken into custody by the relieving officer is pronounced by the medical man and the Justice of the Peace to be a fit subject for further detention; but, whether that is the result or not, the medical officer gets his fee all the same, and the relieving officer who takes the case to his pet medical man also gets his proportion of that fee. I think your Lordships can have little doubt as to the obvious dangers to which this state of things gives rise. What is most significant is the statement in the report adopted by the St. Pancras Vestry, that there is reason to think that the system is not confined to St. Pancras, but is very general. Since this notice appeared on your Lordships' Paper, I have been waited upon by a member of the vestry of St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green, and I will tell your Lordships the result of the communication made to me by him. That vestry found that there existed this dishonest state of relations between their salaried officer and the medical officer and the owners of these private asylums. They drew the attention of the Local Government Board to it as far back as September, 1899. They also drew the attention of the Lunacy Commissioners to it, but the latter replied that they had no authority to deal with the matter. All they could do would be to give warning to the owners of these private asylums that they must not continue to give these douceurs or bribes to the relieving officers. It was not until much later that an inquiry took place by an inspector appointed by the Local Government Board. What the Local Government Board contemplate doing I know not, but I am informed that up to this time they have done nothing. I would like to read to your Lordships two documents. The first is the statement of the relieving officers of Bethnal Green in their own defence. They say, with some *naiveté*:—

> "In order that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of the Board as to our position, and also, if possible, to avoid the trouble and indignity of question and cross-question, we beg to set forth herein the facts of the matter, which we declare to be the truth."

They begin by a general denial that they had been parties to any system of blackmail or tipping, and then proceed in this remarkable language:—

> "The examinations being now conducted by district medical officers, these gentlemen have, in the full exercise of their own free will and judgment, chosen to hand us respectively at the end of each quarter——"

Your Lordships will see that there is a running account between the relieving officer and the medical man.

> —"a sum varying in amount, but usually equal to 5s. for each £1 1s. received for lunacy examination work during the preceding quarter."

And then they say—

> "As to the allegations made with reference to occasional fees being received from private asylums—to wit, Hoxton House and Bethnal Green—the simple fact is that when it is not possible to secure vacancies for cases in the county asylums it has been, and is, the custom of the authorities of these local asylums, through their respective secretaries, to give to the officer concerned an honorarium — at Hoxton House of £2 2s., and at Bethnal Green of £2."

How far these offerings from medical men are to be regarded as a voluntary tribute to the merits of the relieving officers your Lordships will gather from a communication, also furnished to me from one of these relieving officers to the doctor asking for an advance of payment. It is dated 3rd August, 1899, and there is no reason why the relieving officer's name should not be mentioned. It is Christopher A. Forrest, and he writes—

> "Dear Doctor Burdoe,—As a matter of very great urgency I ask you to let me have £1 of next quarter's affair. We have seven cases, and I am going after another one to-night. I do sincerely trust that you will endeavour to oblige."

That is addressed by the receiving officer to a medical gentleman in the neighbourhood. The same gentleman who gave me this information has informed me that since the inquiry last autumn there has been a marked decrease not only in the number of persons detained, but in the number of those originally taken up, so to speak, by the relieving officer and afterwards rejected—in other words, the number of cases is reduced to *bonâ fide* cases. The conclusion is almost irresistible that people have been taken up for examination with a view to fees being obtained. It appears that the guardians have no power, of their own motion, to dismiss these relieving officers; they cannot do that without the sanction of the Local Government Board. It does not appear that they have asked for that sanction in either case. Therefore I have thought it right to call the attention of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who, as I have said, is vested with special authority and responsibility, to the matter, in order to see whether some scheme cannot be devised to prevent the continuance and recurrence of this state of things. I desire also to ask whether the attention of the Law Officers has been drawn to this matter. Has the Public Prosecutor had his attention called to it, because, unless I am greatly mistaken, a clear violation of the law (Lord R. Churchill's Act, 1889) has been perpetrated both by the relieving officers and by the medical men. I see that in the other House of Parliament the learned Attorney General stated, as I expected he would state, that the law is as I conceive it to be. He said—

> "If the facts were as stated an offence of a very serious character had been committed, both by the officials in question and by the persons who were alleged to have given the bribes."

I have a very earnest conviction that this system of corruption is very much more widespread than is generally conceived, and that it is eating into the public sense of morality. It surely is necessary, therefore, that the Government of the country should take notice of this evil.

Lord Russell of Killowen.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I do not think the noble and learned Lord has at all overstated the seriousness of the matters to which he has called attention. I should say at once that the attention of the Commissioners in Lunacy was called to the Bethnal Green case as long ago as last November. They took exactly the same view as the noble and learned Lord does, and invited the Public Prosecutor to consider whether or not there ought to be a prosecution of the persons concerned. The Public Prosecutor, after taking the opinion of counsel, came to the conclusion that the particular section of the Act to which the noble and learned Lord has called attention would not reach those persons who are in the ambit of animadversion. My own attention has been drawn to the matter this year by the Lunacy Commissioners in connection with an amending Lunacy Bill which passed through your Lordships' House on 9th March last. After the Bill had left the House I received from the Commissioners a draft clause, which they suggested, providing that if the proprietor or manager of a house licensed under the principal Act should offer, or cause to be offered, any gift to any person as an inducement to bring any lunatic to the house, he should be guilty of a misdemeanour. I regret to say that the Bill has not been read a second time in the House of Commons. It is, I believe, a measure urgently demanded, not only in regard to the particular matter now brought under review, but on other and general grounds. Looking at the period of the session, I am afraid the Bill is in peril, and so long as the House of Commons permits its business to be delayed by one or two persons who may have particular objections, so long, I am afraid, will great public evils continue to exist. This is, I think, the third time that the Bill has passed through your Lordships' House, and it has not yet had an opportunity of passing into law. Unless some legislation with regard to this subject is placed on the Statute-book the evil will continue to increase. I do not think that the noble and learned Lord has at all exaggerated the matter. If anything, he has understated it. My own belief is that the evil is much more widespread than is supposed, and the facilities with which sometimes certificates of insanity are signed is one of the things which the Bill to which I have referred is intended to correct. This is another branch of the system of corruption to which the noble and learned Lord has previously called attention, and I hope most sincerely that the Bill will pass, and that it will be rendered penal both to give and receive money for these purposes. The case to which the noble and learned Lord has drawn attention occurred since the Bethnal Green case, and there is reason to believe that there are many other cases in which the same system prevails. I only regret that for some technical reasons, with which I need not trouble your Lordships, the Public Prosecutor and the learned counsel whom he consulted were of opinion that under the particular circumstances of this case an indictment would not have a chance of being successful. In a case of this sort an unsuccessful indictment is an extremely dangerous thing, and therefore the Public Prosecutor was quite right in not instituting a prosecution. But no such objection could be raised if the clause to which I have referred had been passed into law. I can only say that the noble and learned Lord has done a public service in calling attention to the matter, and I hope it will not be forgotten in the House of Commons when the question of the Lunacy Bill is under debate.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I should like to ask the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack whether he can give us any information as to any action taken by the Local Government Board. I read that these officers had not been dismissed. If that is the case, it is a most outrageous proceeding. If it is really the case that an important local body in this city have deliberately condoned an offence of this kind and have continued in office persons who have been guilty of these most abominable practices, then if the Local Government Board possesses any powers to deal with that body and to compel them to do their duty, that power ought to be exercised. If, on the other hand, the Local Government Board cannot compel that body to do its duty, the sooner the law is altered the better.

*LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN: I should like to correct a misapprehension under which the noble Earl who has just spoken is labouring. I stated that the local authority had no power to dismiss the officials of their own motion, but that they required the authority and concurrence of the Local Government Board.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Yes; but did they ask for it? That is the point.

*LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN: I believe it is the case that a censure was passed on the officials by the local authority. I am not aware that any application was made to the Local Government Board for their dismissal. With reference to what the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has said, I would remind the House that I have read the language used by the Attorney General a few days ago in the other House upon the very facts which I have mentioned. I do not wish to set up my opinion, not having thoroughly considered the matter, against that of the counsel whom the Public Prosecutor consulted; but, as at present advised, my opinion is that the case comes within the statute known as Lord R. Churchill's Act, and I would suggest that the Lord Chancellor should ask the opinion of the Law Officers on that point.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: Not unnaturally, my mind was more particularly directed to that for which I am responsible, and I have in consequence omitted to state that I have received a communication from the Local Government Board on the subject. It states that the guardians of the parish of St. Pancras have forwarded to the Local Government Board a report in connection with this matter, from which it appears that the guardians have publicly and severely censured the relieving officers and warned them that any recurrence of the offence will result in their immediate suspension from duty. In view of the gravity of the charge, the Board have directed that a careful inquiry shall be held by one of their inspectors. The Local Government Board state that the charges in the Bethnal Green case appear to be well founded, but they have not yet given their decision in that case. As it is alleged that similar practices prevail in other parishes, the Local Government Board propose to address a circular letter to boards of guardians on the subject.

SECRETARIES TO IRISH COUNTY COUNCILS.

*THE EARL OF ARRAN: My Lords, I rise to ask Her Majesty's Government whether the delay which has occured between the election of a secretary to the Mayo County Council and the ratification of that election by the Local Government Board has been the cause of any additional expense; and, if so, whether such additional expense will be borne by the Local Government Board or the ratepayers of the county; whether for the future it will not be possible in all similar circumstances to oblige candidates to satisfy the Local Government Board that they possess one or other of the qualifications for the post of secretary to a county council, as laid down by the Board's instructions, before presenting themselves before the county council for election instead of after the election, as was in this instance the case. In asking this question I should like also to put another question to the noble Lord of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether before ratifying the appointment the Local Government Board had taken any steps to ascertain the fitness of Mr. D. O'Connor Kelly, the late secretary to the Mayo County Council, for that post, to which he was appointed by the council, and, if not, whether the expense caused by the condition of the accounts when Mr. Kelly resigned the office will be borne by the Local Government Board or the ratepayers. The circumstances are these. On the resignation of the secretary to the Grand Jury (Mr. Blake), Mr. D. O'Connor Kelly was appointed secretary to the county council in his place. I have no reason to doubt the talents of Mr. D. O'Connor Kelly, but apparently they were not such as made him a very efficient secretary to the county council, because the state of business became so bad that the Local Government Board were forced to write a very strong letter to the Mayo County Council setting forth the condition of affairs and begging that the business should be at once put upon a satisfactory footing. Whether in consequence of this letter or not I am not able to say, but at any rate Mr. D. O'Connor Kelly resigned his post, and it was then found that the condition of accounts was such—I wish at once to say that I am only referring to their confusion—that a staff of forty-five clerks had to be sent down by the Local Government Board to put them in a proper condition. The clerks were so long at work that the expense occasioned amounted to something like £1,000. What I want to know is, will this £1,000 be borne by the ratepayers or by the Local Government Board. I have not been able to discover that the Local Government Board took any steps before sanctioning the appointment to ascertain whether Mr. Kelly was competent to fulfil the duties of the office. The Local Government Board must have been perfectly well aware of the circumstances under which the appointment was made. The circumstances of the appointment by the Mayo County Council would not be very interesting to your Lordships, and I will merely say that the gentlemen who made the appointment were men possessing the purest and highest motives of patriotism according to their lights, and that their only object was to save the pockets of the ratepayers whom they represented and whose votes they hoped to get again at the next election. They were, however, under a certain feeling of fear of the most powerful man in Ireland at this moment, Mr. William O'Brien, and, under those circumstances, the Local Government Board should have taken the utmost pains to see that any appointment made by them was really a fitting one. I now come to the questions standing in my name on the Paper. The case is as follows: An advertisement was issued in the newspapers stating that an election of a secretary to the Mayo County Council would take place on a certain date, and this advertisement was signed by the acting secretary who had been sent down by the Local Government Board. It was distinctly stated in that advertisement that no person should be eligible to be appointed to the office unless he had been secretary to another county council, or had proved by examination that he was fitted for the post. Three candidates of importance came before the council. One certainly fulfilled all the conditions laid down in the advertisement. The county council, however, elected a gentleman who had absolutely no qualifications, and when his appointment was communicated to the Local Government Board, that body also ignored the fact that he had passed no examination. They proceeded to set him an examination, and gave him six weeks to prepare for it. I should like to know whether any extra expense was caused by this six weeks delay, which was altogether irregular.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I am afraid a little confusion exists with regard to the noble Earl's questions, because he commences by asking me a question which is not on the Paper. I do not know whether that is what he referred to when he spoke of a question of which he had given me private notice.

*THE EARL OF ARRAN: I sent the notice to the Irish Office.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: When?

*THE EARL OF ARRAN: Before the holidays.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I heard of that, but as the noble Lord did not put it on the Paper I understood that he was not going to ask it. I am afraid I have not got a very full answer to the questions asked as to the expense incurred in the unravelling of the accounts referred to. I can only say that the appointment of the late secretary was not ratified by the Local Government Board; on the contrary, the Department refused to ratify it because the late secretary declined to present himself for examination. If the noble Earl wishes me to make further inquiries with regard to the expense incurred I will do so if he will place a question on the Paper.

*THE EARL OF ARRAN: Then I understand the late secretary was acting solely on the election of the county council, without his appointment being ratified by the Local Government Board?

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: That is the Report which is given by the Local Government Board. The delay which occurred between the election of a secretary to the Mayo County Council and the ratification of the appointment by the Local Government Board has caused no additional expense either to the county or to the Department. In answer to the other question, the Local Government Board report that it would not be practicable to require all the candidates to satisfy them that they are possessed of the requisite qualifications before they present themselves for election.

House adjourned at half-past Seven of the clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 26*th June*, 1900.

DUBLIN ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL (BY ORDER.)

Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

MR. CAREW (Dublin, College Green): I beg to move "That the Bill be considered upon this day six months." I move the rejection of this Bill on the ground that the corporation are the proper people to have this matter in their own hands, and that the local town commissioners intended the following year to promote a Bill to get the necessary power. The grounds upon which the Dublin Corporation oppose this Bill are even stronger than those which secured the rejection of the Bill promoted by the Dundalk Gas Company. It may be said that the electrical supply of the corporation has not been of a satisfactory character, but the reason for that is to be found in the fact that the amount of money which the corporation were enabled to spend at that time—namely, the sum of £89,000—in the erection of plant was found to be insufficient to supply their wants, and having exhausted their borrowing powers they were unable to go any further. In the last session of Parliament, the Dublin Corporation Markets Bill extended their borrowing powers to over £700,000. Immediately that was passed the corporation arranged a scheme of electric lighting, and an eminent electrical engineer had estimated that the city of Dublin could be lighted for an expenditure of £250,000. They then applied to the Local Government Board to sanction the raising of that sum, and they placed their scheme before them. A local inquiry, which lasted several days, was held at which the promoters of this Bill opposed the corporation scheme, but the result was that the Local Government Board passed the scheme. On the second reading of this Bill, the question of competition was discussed fully and as a result, in a very small House, there was a small majority against the corporation in favour of this Bill. In the meantime, the corporation has succeeded in obtaining a scheme which has been sanctioned by the Local Government Board notwithstanding the opposition of the promoters of this Bill, and I think it would be a very unfair thing on the part of Parliament if they allowed another company to enter into competition with the local authority. In the case of the Dundalk Bill the House would not allow it to pass, and now we ask Parliament not to establish a precedent of this character against the wishes of the local authority. This Bill as it now stands authorises the promoters to construct works and break up the streets of Dublin, and supply electricity in competition with the city of Dublin. One eminent witness at the inquiry was asked if he had ever known a case where a private company had ever been allowed to enter into competition with the local authority, and he answered "No, I have not." I think that the House of Commons should be very slow to allow such a weak case to override the wishes of the Corporation of Dublin by passing a Bill of this kind. I merely ask the House of Commons to think twice before adopting this measure.

*MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to second the rejection of this Bill, and do so on more than local grounds. I object on well-established principles, as I maintain that the corporation should be its own contractor for public utilities, eliminating middlemen. I would ask the House to look further abroad than Dublin in this matter, and to examine what is the general usage in this particular question. I would appeal particularly to London Members to consider carefully the object lesson which this Bill furnishes. Surely the time has gone by when this House will permit monopolies, or, rather, competitions against local authorities who ought to supply these public utilities. About the year 1882 Parliament partially stopped private monopolies in these things, but did not sufficiently encourage local authorities. We are now concerned with the Act of 1888, under which almost every existing undertaking of this character has been established. The House should remember by that Act company and municipal undertakings were placed under the same conditions as commercial concerns. The companies were allowed rights for forty-two years, and at the end of that time if they were required to do so, they must sell their undertaking and their plant at the price of old metal. With regard to the capital, the local authority had to pay it back within thirty years, and both plant and capital were almost in the same ratio whether owned by a private company or a corporation. The Board of Trade has always given local authorities the preference in granting Provisional Orders, and it has manifestly been the intention of Parliament that public bodies should take charge of public utilities. But public bodies move very slowly, and legislation, both local and Imperial, is generally behind the requirements of public opinion, and legislators have to be stirred up occasionally by the pressure of public opinion. It so happens that shrewd capitalists, foreseeing the requirements of the community, have started by getting Provisional Orders, and here in England they got possession of large areas, notably in such places as Liverpool, Leeds, and Sheffield. In some of these districts by the pressure of the ratepayers and public opinion local authorities have been obliged to take over these undertakings and paid very dearly for them. I have here a long list of figures, but I will refer to only four. In Birmingham, that model city, the amount expended in the installation of the electric light by a private company was £219,000, but the municipality of Birmingham not long ago purchased that undertaking, and they paid for it £420,000. In Liverpool the amount expended by a private electric lighting company was £264,711, and the municipality were obliged to pay for that concern no less than £436,474. In Leeds the amount expended was £217,420, and the municipality were obliged to pay £370,580. In Sheffield the ratio was almost the same, and similar results occurred in other places. I want to know if this House intends to inflict a similar financial loss upon the ratepayers of Dublin. This is a most important matter, and many people will agree with me that, in the interests of the community, the electric supply should be in the hands of the local authority, and not be allowed to pass into the private ownership which is set up by this Bill. In debating a subject of this kind we are bound to look at it from various points of view. What is the position of electricity at the present time? The number of private companies supplying electricity with works in operation are fifty-nine, as against 109 by municipalities. In regard to works in course of construction, municipalities possess sixty-seven and companies twenty. In regard to Provisional Orders, municipalities hold 105 and companies only nine. Are we now going to add to that small number of nine instead of adding one to the 105 held by municipalities? Let me compare briefly the charges for current of these systems. I was reading the other day the report of the British Association, and I find that a gentleman read a paper on this subject, and he compared twenty-one municipal undertakings with the undertakings of twenty-one private companies. He found that the cost of production in the case of municipalities was 1·87d. per unit, whilst in the case of companies the cost was 2.71d. The average charge per unit made by these twenty-one municipalities was 4½d., whilst the average charge of the companies was 5½d., or a penny more than the municipalities. This is not my own statement, for these figures were given at a meeting of the British Association, and may be tested by anyone. I have been looking up the question of indiscriminate municipal trading, to which many hon. Members of this House are properly opposed. A gentleman named M. Emile Garcke, who is a great opponent of municipal trading, has carefully gone into the whole question of companies and municipal supplies. He has made a report, and he states that the average cost per unit of production in the case of companies is 5·51d., while that of municipalities is 4·35d. Therefore, it will be seen that these affairs are not so economically managed by private companies as by local authorities. The same authority also states that the profits made by companies was 5·51 per cent., whilst that of municipalities was 5·5 per cent., so that the municipalities produce cheaper and also make more profit. I have another reason why, as the representative of the City of Dublin, I am for opposing a Bill of this kind, because it proposes to divert and take away a source of future revenue, and place it into the pockets of private shareholders. This is one of the strongest arguments against this Bill. Regarding English cities, in Leeds they have reduced the price of the electric supply ½d. per unit, and they have made a profit last year of £17,258. In Liverpool they have reduced the price from 6·86d. per unit to 4·69d., and in Sheffield they have taken 1½d. off the price charged originally, and still they all work at a profit. It is the same all over the kingdom. I am in communication with a gentleman from Brighton upon this subject, in which he says:—

> "I enclose cutting from *The Municipal Journal*. You will see there that our manager, Mr. Wright, was expert for the company, and, though he objected to Dublin going outside its area for a generating station, he is at Brighton most strongly advocating us going outside to build a new one."

Here we have Mr. Wright giving evidence before the Local Government Board in Dublin, and urging as a reason why the new scheme of the corporation should be objected to, that the Dublin Corporation were going outside the limits of the City; while on the other hand we have the same gentleman advocating that very thing in his own city. I will just read a very brief extract from the *Municipal Journal*. It says—

> "At the first day's inquiry Mr. Healy boasted that his chief witness, Mr. Wright, would contradict everything which Mr. Hammond said. Mr. Wright, when he went into the witness box, did more—he contradicted himself. Mr. Wright is one of those gentlemen who occupy an anomalous position: he is for the municipality in Brighton and in Whitechapel; for private monopoly in Cork and Dublin, and half a dozen other places; for the Wright patent measuring apparatus everywhere, and for Mr. Wright all the time. A man with such a contradictory professional career cannot be expected to turn out a convincing or consistent witness."

I have no desire to attack Mr. Wright or anybody else; I merely mention the facts, and Gentlemen can inquire further into the matter if they wish. In the course of the last debate the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade treated the Members who opposed this Bill rather harshly. To those acquainted with the facts it is evident that the Dublin Corporation were unable to develop the electric lighting scheme owing to the want of funds and the lack of a suitable generating station. Both these obstacles have now been removed, and the Corporation have taken measures to enable them to undertake efficiently the electric lighting of the city. I have made inquiries among the large cities of England, and it is perfectly evident that the profits derived from electric lighting by the municipal authorities is applied to the reduction of taxation. But it appears to me that the City of Dublin is given exceptional treatment in many things. The citizens of Dublin are entitled to fair play and equal treatment from this House with regard to matters which are non-political, and I hope this Bill will be rejected. I have been looking at what the President of the Board of Trade has said on this matter. In the session of 1899 when the General Power Distribution Bill was before the House of Commons it was rejected on Second Reading by 164 to 132, notwithstanding the fact that the promoters of the Bill, in the course of the debate, undertook not to supply electricity except with the consent of the corporations concerned. But here we have a company seeking to obtain a Bill from this House absolutely in opposition to the corporation. In the course of the discussion on the occasion to which I have referred, the President of the Board of Trade is reported as having said—

> "It seemed to him that the principle of the Bill was a direct attack upon the right privileges and duties of municipal corporations, and whatever might have been the contingent advantages which might accrue in consequence of the passage of this Bill, I should have been bound to tell the House I did not think it would be wise in passing a Bill which practically sets aside the existing law which adequately protects corporations in the exercise of the duties which they have to discharge. Any private Bill of that kind, setting aside rights which corporations have by law, ought to be rejected."

That is just my position to-day. I take up the position of the President of the Board of Trade at that time. The Lancashire Electric Bill of 1900 came up for Second Reading on the 1st March last, and the hon. Member who moved the rejection referred to this statement of the right hon. Gentleman, when the President of the Board of Trade interrupted and said—

> "That Bill not only took power to go through the streets, but also to distribute light and electric power throughout the municipal area; my statement referred to that, and when the hon. Member for Macclesfield withdrew that part of the Bill I said he had met my objection and that I would support the Second Reading."

I would remark here that the powers thus referred and objected to by the right hon. Gentleman are all included in the Bill of this present company. Towards the end of the debate the hon. Member for Cardiff asked whether the written undertaking of the promoters of the Lancashire Bill that they would do nothing without the consent of the local authorities would apply to the South Wales Bill, and the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Unless the promoters of this Bill are willing to accept a provision of that kind I should not be prepared to vote for the Second Reading."

Under these circumstances I trust that the right hon. Gentleman and those who follow him will vote against this Bill. It seems to me that the action of the right hon. Gentleman on the Second Reading of the Dublin Electric Lighting Bill is hardly consistent with the course he has adopted with regard to English Bills. A large loan has been sanctioned by the Local Government Board for the purpose ef enabling the corporation to carry out an efficient scheme, and where Parliament, through the Local Government Board, has authorised a municipal corporation to borrow money for a municipal undertaking on the security of the rates, and the corporation is establishing or has established an undertaking, these special Parliamentary powers ought not to be granted to a private company, trading for profit, to undertake similar works in competition with the corporation. I am opposed to this Bill because, if competition were entered into, it would interfere very much with the electric lighting of the city in the future by the corporation. Another reason is the opening up of the streets. The breaking up of the streets is a great obstacle which has been recognised by those outside Ireland. I happen to be a member of the United Kingdom Trade Protection Society, and I find that at a meeting in the City of London the following resolution was carried—

> "That it be represented to the Parliamentary Committee now sitting to consider the question of municipal trading, that any enterprise requiring interference with the surface of public streets, such as gas, water, electricity, hydraulic power, or telephones, trams, etc., should be under the control of municipalities

as trustees for the rights of the public in the thoroughfares of cities and boroughs, but that it is undesirable for municipalities to engage in retail trades."

Here you have such a society passing a resolution of this kind unanimously. I would ask the House to reject this Bill by a large majority, because it is an interference with the rights and privileges of municipalities, because it seeks to take away from the ratepayer a revenue which should be applied to the reduction of the rates, and that it will enable a private company to tear up the streets and to interfere with the convenience of traffic in the city. On these grounds, as a representative of Dublin, I trust that the House will reject this Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and add the words 'three months.'"—(*Mr. Carew.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. BROWN (Shropshire, Wellington), speaking as Chairman of the Committee which considered and passed the preamble of the Bill, said it was proved that for many years past the Corporation of Dublin had had power to provide the electric light and had failed to do so. Had the corporation done its duty there would have been no case made out for this Bill. The hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill had referred to the case of the Dundalk Bill, but he denied that there was any parallel between the two cases. He could only say that if the Dublin Corporation continued in the future to manage their electric lighting works as they had done in the past, he should congratulate himself that he was not a ratepayer of the city. What was the case of this Bill? It was that for many years past the Corporation of Dublin had had the power to provide the light, as he had already stated, and had absolutely failed to do so. Under these circumstances, was it not right that a new competitor should be allowed to come in and supply a great want? When the Bill was before the Committee it was proved beyond doubt that the supply of electric light was practically *nil.* The corporation obtained its Provisional Order in 1892, and what had been the result of its eight years' work? There was general dissatisfaction, the price charged (7d. per unit) was the maximum allowed under the order, there had been inability to supply without unreasonable delay, and many of the inhabitants of Dublin, because they had been unable to obtain what they wanted from the corporation, had had themselves to go to the expense of setting up private installations. Had any English corporation acted in the same way as Dublin the House would have let in a private competitor. An offer was made to the corporation by an electric supply company in Dublin to supply electricity at a comparatively cheap price, but that offer was refused. The corporation sought to explain their inaction by stating that they had not borrowing powers to enable them to raise the capital necessary for the work they had undertaken, but it should not be forgotten that they could, at any time within the last eight years, have obtained such powers had they applied to Parliament. Then, with regard to the quality of the light itself it had been stated to be "the worst in the kingdom, if not in the world"! With regard to the charges, while many local authorities were enabled to supply the light at even less than 4d. per unit, the Dublin Corporation were charging above 6d., and they were charging more than was charged in Cork, a much smaller city. The company by which this Bill was promoted expected to be able to supply the light at an average cost of 4½d., and it was a matter of surprise, therefore, that the Dublin witnesses before the Committee heartily welcomed the idea of competition. That the corporation scheme had proved a failure was evidenced by the fact that they had only 250 consumers. He hoped the House would confirm the decision at which the Committee had arrived after long and careful inquiry.

*MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I am sorry, after the long debate which has already taken place, that it should be necessary for me to speak on this question, but I will be as brief as I can. I am in the position of having sat on the Committee which passed this Bill, and of having differed so strongly from the decision arrived at that I felt it necessary to divide the Committee. I am therefore bound to put before the House the grounds upon which I acted. With regard to the facts of the case I do not think there was any serious difference of opinion between the members of the Committee, or, indeed, between any of the parties concerned. The question at issue was one of policy and of the right interpretation of the facts. The House is being asked, by passing this Bill, to create an entirely new precedent. It has been so far the consistent policy of Parliament and of the Board of Trade to refuse to permit any private company to come in and compete in the matter of electric lighting in any town where the corporation has undertaken the work, and is unwilling to permit any private company to come in. But in this case you are going to make a change. The city of Dublin is the *corpus vile* upon which you are going to try your experiment, though the corporation is strongly, decidedly, and unhesitatingly against your doing so. You are asked to do this because, during the last ten years, the Corporation of Dublin has not carried out the lighting scheme over a small area in the centre of the city to the satisfaction of some of the ratepayers. I agree with the other members of the Committee, and it was, in fact, admitted by the council for the corporation, that up till the present the electric light supply has been insufficient, and that in many cases there has been good cause for complaint. But are there not some palliating circumstances, and are there not good reasons why the corporation were unable to carry out the work satisfactorily? I think there are. In the first place, the corporation undertook the work at a time when electric lighting was comparatively new, and, in the second place, they only had a small area over which to carry out their operations. It is impossible under such circumstances to get a cheap supply.

*MR. BROWN: The compulsory area was small, but the corporation, if they liked, could supply the light to the whole of the city of Dublin.

*MR. TREVELYAN: No; they could not do that, because they had not borrowing powers, and it was not until last year that they did obtain power to borrow sufficient money to enable them to carry on their operations over an extended area. What the House has to decide is whether the history of the past proves the incapacity of Dublin to manage the very much larger scheme which the corporation is now prepared to undertake. I myself came to the conclusion that there was nothing to warrant the assumption of general incapacity. It is quite certain that the corporation, during the last year or two, have become alive to the defects of the smaller lighting scheme which they are carrying out, and they have been doing everything in their power to remedy the defects and to establish a larger scheme. As a matter of fact, a year or two before this private company was thought of the corporation was doing everything it could to provide a more extensive scheme. It had obtained the assistance of an engineer whose ability is recognised on both sides of the Channel, and the moment they got the opportunity they went to the Local Government Board and said, "we have now got sufficient borrowing powers, will you give us the powers necessary for carrying out an extended scheme?" Their request was granted, and at the present moment the corporation has power to spend a quarter of a million upon an extensive scheme; it has power to put up stations all over Dublin, it has excellent engineers to carry out the work, and I maintain that it ought to have an opportunity of accomplishing its object before you admit of any competition. Give Dublin the benefit of the doubt. It has not done very well in the past, but it promises to turn over a new leaf, and to do better in the future. Suppose Glasgow came to this House and said, "We have a small tramway, or electric lighting scheme, or water scheme. We have not done very well in the past for the ratepayers, but we ask you for larger powers." What would be the reply of this House? Would you allow a new competitor to come in in that case, especially if Glasgow told you that your doing so would make it impossible for them to succeed? I do not think you would, and yet you are asked by this Bill to do that very thing in the case of Dublin. I think you ought not to do it, and I trust that Members who are anxious to treat Ireland well, and who have no fixed idea that Irishmen are unable to govern themselves properly, will join with me in trusting Irishmen a little, and will not extend to them the exceptional treatment proposed by this Bill—treatment which I am sure would not in any case be applied to Yorkshire or Lancashire, or to any place in Scotland.

* MR. RUTHERFORD (Lancashire, Darwen) said the real question before the House was, are corporations to have competition under any circumstances or conditions whatever, whether they carried on these undertakings well or badly? He had the honour and privilege of being the Mayor of a large county borough. He was a member of the Committee which sat upon this Bill, and, after hearing the evidence given before it, he came to the conclusion that had his own borough, of which he was chief magistrate, carried out an electric lighting scheme in the same way as had been done by the Corporation of Dublin, he would have been among the first to advocate the introduction of competition. It was proved beyond all question that the Corporation of Dublin had done its work extremely ill. £90,000 had already been spent in electric lighting works, and yet, out of a population of 300,000, the corporation had only got 250 customers for its electricity. Again, they were charging the maximum of sevenpence per unit, while in a smaller city like Cork a much lower rate was being charged, and after one year's working in Cork the system had produced a profit, whereas in the city of Dublin there was a loss of £2,800 a year. The corporation had managed its affairs badly, and one witness stated that, although he had two warehouses separated merely by a street, the corporation refused to allow him to use the light for the two warehouses by carrying the wire across the street. He did not think they would find any private company acting in such a ridiculous manner. Another witness complained that, although he wanted the light, he was told he would have to wait years for it, and another said that, while he had it, it often went out, and they had to resort to the use of candles. Another firm had spent £3,000 upon a private installation, but, despite that, would gladly get their supply from a private company should one be established in Dublin. The present system was bad for the corporation and disastrous for the ratepayers, and he therefore hoped the House would endorse the decision come to by the Committee after a very exhaustive inquiry.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I submit that in this Bill we are debating a question of very great importance. We are asked by it, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend the Member for the Elland division, to establish a precedent. Anybody who has studied the question of electric lighting must know that it is now the rule for local authorities in England, Scotland, and Wales to light their own towns. I am afraid that Members hardly appreciate the fact that upwards of 100 local authorities are at this moment doing electric lighting business. That is the case in Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, Edinburgh, and Leeds, as well as in several London constituencies, and I think it will be admitted that these local authorities have done the work much more cheaply than private companies could have done it. I challenge contradiction when I assert that the local authorities have succeeded in reducing the price of the electric light to a point lower than has ever been reached by any private company. I believe there are some local authorities who at the present moment are charging an average price of 3½d. per unit, and I am sure that no single private company could produce the light at the same price. I want to ask the House is there any precedent for acting as this Bill proposes? The Chairman of the Committee on the Bill told us that if any English Corporation had acted in the same way as the Dublin Corporation the House would at once have given a private company the right to compete with the local authority. But we have had no experience of the kind. No such case has ever yet occurred, and, for the first time, we are asked to establish the principle of permitting private competition with a public body which already has the power, as well as the duty, of supplying the electric light. I think this House is being asked to take an extremely grave and serious step, and to establish an extremely grave and serious precedent. What is to prevent a private company saying, "We have to complain of the manner in which the Manchester Corporation does its work"? I am perfectly sure that the Manchester Corporation does its work most admirably, but some complaints from some individuals could be brought forward. What would the House think if a number of Manchester capitalists came and told us, "We are a number of Manchester capitalists dissatisfied with the manner in which the corporation does its work, and we wish to be allowed to enter into competition with the corporation"? I venture to say that the House would scout such a proposal, and no one would venture to make such a proposal with respect to an English, Scotch, or Welsh city as is now being made regarding Dublin, in the face of every authority entitled to speak on behalf of that city. The hon. Member said that the Irish member of the Committee, the hon. Member for Derry, supported the majority in the Committee. That, I understand, is so. He is entitled to speak as a man of great authority who has had a good deal of business experience, but the hon. Gentleman is not entitled to speak for Dublin in opposition to the three Members for Dublin with respect to this Bill. He is not entitled to speak for Dublin against my hon. friend who moved the rejection of the Bill, nor for the Corporation of Dublin, which after all is the representative authority of the citizens. I know that some hon. Members will vote for the Bill for a reason which I think is both irrelevant, and, if I may say so without offence, unworthy, and that is, obstinate dislike and disapproval of the Corporation of Dublin. I have heard one or two Irish Members on the other side declare that they would vote against any Bill if they were only convinced the Corporation of Dublin was in favour of it, and that they would vote for any Bill to which the corporation was opposed. What would be said if I came here and asked that the Corporation of Liverpool should not get an electric lighting Bill because there is a permanent Conservative majority there, or that the Corporation of Edinburgh should not get a similar measure because there is a permanent Liberal majority there? This House would say that these matters should be judged locally on their merits, and on these alone. I submit another proposition, and it is this: wherever a corporation or a local authority has had to acquire the property of a private electric lighting company, it has had to do so at enormously increased expense, to the profit of the shareholders and the promoters, and if you allow this company to be established, and if in time the Corporation of Dublin should be forced, as it may well be forced, to buy up the rights which Parliament is going to bestow upon the company, in spite of the ratepayers and in prejudice of the ratepayers of Dublin, I prophesy that the corporation will be bound to do it at a very enhanced price. In Sheffield the corporation paid the electric lighting company £272,398 for a concern on which the company spent £124,472. In Leeds, the corporatien paid £370,580 for what cost the company £217,420. In Birmingham the corporation paid £420,000 for what cost the company £219,000. In Liverpool, where the electric lighting is admirably conducted, the corporation paid £436,000 for what cost the company £264,000. What this House is now asked to do is to put this company in a position to fine the people of Dublin for the purpose of getting back the right to do work which they wish to do now. My hon. friend the Member for South Islington represents in a special manner the local authorities of this country, because he is chairman of the Association of Municipal Corporations. The hon. Gentleman was in Dublin the other day when the annual gathering of that Association took place. The Association consists of men of all political parties, representing different towns, and one of the first things they did was to pass a resolution that electric lighting was one of the things which the local authorities were entitled to hold and have. Two hon. Gentlemen who have spoken have been large and generous in their abuse of the Corporation of Dublin with regard to this question of electric lighting. I understand what their vote means. Their vote means that they mean to censure the Corporation of Dublin, and take this work out of their hands, because they think the corporation have not done the work well. I do not know a single member of the corporation, except some of my hon. friends on these benches, who are also members of that body; but I think the case that is made against them has been unduly severe. What are the facts? The corporation spent £90,000 on the electric light supply of Dublin which you will render futile by passing this Bill. When they had spent that sum they found that they had not completed the work, but they were at the end of their borrowing powers. As everybody acquainted with Dublin knows, they have one of the best water supplies in the world. It was a very expensive water supply, and having spent money on that scheme they could not raise sufficient money to complete the work of electric lighting. They came to this House long before this company was thought of, and asked the House to give them additional borrowing powers. The House gave them additional borrowing powers, and the corporation then brought forward a large and, I believe, a thoroughly good scheme for completing the work of electric lighting, making good the evils and the blots that were pointed out under the insufficient scheme. The scheme was brought before the Local Government Board, an inquiry ordered by the Board was held in Dublin, and the Board sanctioned the scheme, and at this moment the corporation is ready to carry out this larger scheme if only this House will give it the right and the power. I think it is a very strong thing indeed to ask this House on behalf of private capitalists to stand in the way of the corporation, which has the approval of the citizens, who, I think, are largely against this private company. The hon. Gentleman opposite made one point with which I wish to deal. He said, if you do not allow this competition, and if you allow the corporation to do this work, it will be hard on the ratepayers of Dublin. I know that a good many Members have been carried away with the cry that, after all, if you allow this private company to go to work, it will only cause healthy competition, which can do no harm to anyone. I will deal with that. In the first place, this form of competition has never been permitted before, and I daresay will never be asked by any representative of an English or Scotch constituency. I believe any such proposal with regard to Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, or Glasgow would be scouted. It is only when you come to Ireland that capitalists dare propose such a system of competition. Competition may be healthy or unhealthy. It is usually healthy to the consumer. It is unhealthy competition when it is a matter of supplying electric light. Look at the condition you bring the city into by such competition. You have a company making mains and tearing up the roads on one side, and you have the corporation making mains and tearing up the roads on the other side, at great expense and to the great inconvenience of the citizens. The second point is, that this competition will be competition of a private company with the citizens of Dublin. It will not be competition of one private company with another, which is perfectly fair competition. It will be competition of a private company with a public corporation, and I call that unhealthy competition. As to the rates, I say if you leave this in the hands of the corporation, as I think you are bound to do in justice to Dublin, it will be for the relief of the rates. Why, compare Dublin with other cities. In Liverpool the other day I saw one of the best systems of tramways in the world. In Glasgow recently I saw an excellent system of tramway locomotion. Both these undertakings are in the hands of the corporations. In Dublin the tramway system is in the hands of a private company, and some of the men connected with that company are the men who are behind this electric lighting scheme. The tramway company in Dublin has what, I think, will surprise the House. In any other city the tramway lease is usually for twenty-one years; in Dublin it is for forty years. I will not inquire into the means by which the tramways company obtained this extraordinary concession. I daresay it can be justified, but what is the result? The £10 shares of this company now stand at £19 5s., and very properly, because it has a concession unequalled and unparalleled in the history of municipal enterprise. The company makes a net profit of £40,000 or £50,000 a year, and the profit, which in several other cities, such as Glasgow or Liverpool, is used to relieve the rates and improve the condition of the masses of the people, goes into the hands of the private individuals who are the shareholders of the company. If you give the powers now asked for in this Bill in opposition to the Members for the city of Dublin, in opposition to the corporation of the city, and in opposition to the public feeling of Dublin, and in opposition to the majority of the Irish Members now present, you are going to repeat in the case of the electric lighting system what you did in regard to the tramway system, and you will give £50,000 a year to private individuals which ought to go to the people of Dublin in relief of the rates, and for the improvement of the city. If there is any city in the world which has a right to be saved from this system it is the city of Dublin. I see the hon. Member for South Tyrone in his place. If he were asked to describe the state of the city of Dublin, he would give a picture of overcrowding, disease and poverty unparalleled in any city in the Empire, and is that city to be deprived of the blessing and relief of municipal lighting given to other cities? If so, it is a cruel wrong, and an injustice to the Corporation of Dublin and to the masses of the people in that city.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): We have listened to a very impassioned speech from the hon. Member, and it is evident that there is some politics behind this Bill. The Bill nominally deals with electric lighting, but I can assure the House that there is a great deal of gas at the bottom of it. It is a remarkable fact that the people who are most anxious for the continuation of this monopoly in the hands of the Corporation of Dublin are the gas company of Dublin. The House will hardly credit it when I tell them that the leading promoter of this competition with the gas company is the chairman and managing director of that company itself, Alderman Cotton, who is a member of the Dublin Corporation. Why, I ask, is the gas company so extremely anxious—because it is the gas company we are fighting to-day, and not the corporation, and the gas company is paying for the opposition to this Bill—why is the gas company so extremely anxious that this matter should remain in the hands of the Dublin Corporation? Because it knows that the corporation, having muddled away with the assistance of the gas company £100,000 of the ratepayers' money, will muddle away another £100,000 more if this Bill is rejected. Why, I want to know, should I as a ratepayer of Dublin have to pay 7d. per unit for my electricity in Dublin when if I lived in Cork I could get it for 3d.? The hon. Member who has just sat down made a long attack upon the tramway company. My remarks may be received with this amount of discount—that when the corporation was endeavouring to obtain a loan I appeared professionally for the tramway company against the corporation, but otherwise I had nothing to do with this Bill. When the Bill came up for Second Reading I declined to vote for it, but all reference to the tramway company has now been struck out, and therefore the question now is between competition in Dublin and a monopoly. I am bound to state exactly why the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool has made his attack upon the tramway company. It is this. The chairman of the tramway company is a former Member of this House, Mr. W. M. Murphy, a well-known Home Ruler. He is the *bête noire* of the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Scotland Division. What the hon. Member did not tell the House was that this tramway company, for the concession which he said no other company in the universe had got, has to pay to the corporation a rent of £12,000 a year and £300 for every additional mile of tramway which it makes. It is the corporation that ought to be attacked if the bargain were a bad one, but I think the corporation made an extremely good bargain. The gas company runs a newspaper in Dublin called the *Freeman's Journal.* The chairman of the gas company was its chief director, but he is unfortunately no more. When there was a campaign on the Home Rule question in Dublin as to the journalism of that city, it was the chairman of the gas company who furnished certain hon. Members of this House with bogus shares to the value of £1,000 in order to oust men like myself from the board of the *Freeman's Journal.* The tramway company also has an organ called the *Daily Nation*, and in that paper the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Scotland Division is sometimes unduly criticised, and no doubt politics are at the bottom of this opposition—politics and gas—and not the question of electric lighting. I desire to say why I think the opposition on the part of the corporation is unwise. The Corporation of Dublin, on the Second Reading of this Bill, were beaten by a vote of this House, and it was decided to leave the matter to a Select Committee. Although we were all glad to hear the speech of the hon. Gentleman above the gangway, curiously enough, although he was a member of the Select Committee, he voted against the Second Reading of the Bill which he was afterwards appointed to sit upon the Committee to consider. That, I think, considerably discounts the position he has taken up in the House, for he sat as a member of a Committee to consider a thing which he had voted should not come before the Committee at all. But that did not save him with the *Freeman's Journal*, because the most eloquent denunciations against him for his illiberality as a member of that Committee appeared in that journal. Why am I anxious that this stage should not be opposed? The principle of this Bill has been already dealt with on the Second Reading. Its details were considered by the Committee, who decided that the corporation had for ten years been tried, and had been found wanting. If the corporation attack the decision of this Committee to-day, what will happen to its Boundaries Bill? That Boundaries Bill is of far greater importance to the Corporation of Dublin than this electric lighting business. That Bill is before a joint Committee of the Lords and Commons. Am I to be told, when the House of Lords last year rejected the corporation's Boundaries Bill on the recommendation of its own Committee, that if the corporation does not respect the decision of a Committee of the Commons in relation to this Bill its opponents in the House of Lords will be bound to respect a decision of a Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons in respect to the Boundaries Bill? As the Corporation of Dublin have had their run on the Second Reading, and have still a further inquiry in the House of Lords into this question, it is greatly to be regretted that they did not content themselves with the decision of the Committee, and try to amend, if they could, or to secure the rejection of this Bill elsewhere. I am strongly in favour of the Corporation of Dublin having all the rights and legitimate powers possible in regard to this matter. Unlike the hon. Member for the Scotland Division, I live in Dublin; I do my work in Dublin; I pay rates and taxes in Dublin; and it is to my interest that the corporation should be conducted and have its proceedings managed in a manner creditable to the citizens. Still, I do not want to pay 7d. for electricity when I can get it for 2½d. I am not prepared to pay 4½d. per unit for municipalisation. The corporation has already muddled away £100,000. I do not blame them very much for that, because electricity was in a new state, and it was only two years ago that Professor Kennedy contended that two electrical lines could not cross without some system of induction which would be fatal to the whole of the two systems. An American engineer immediately brought forward a little standard advertisement showing that this thing which Professor Kennedy thought was an absolute impossibility was as common as dirt in every city from San Francisco to New York. I therefore do not blame the Corporation of Dublin to any great extent for the mess into which they had got themselves electrically. The position in which they found themselves was this: They started handicapped with a dead weight and a loss o £100,000, and they could never hope to supply the citizens of Dublin as cheaply as a company which started without any such dead weight would be able to do. It is perfectly true that the corporation did act harshly in some cases, but that may have been the work of over zealous officials. What has resulted is that the corporation have had for ten years the cream of the city, all the richest business parts, and yet they have not been able to make a profit. If that is the case with regard to the cream of the city, are they likely to make a profit out of the slums? Furthermore, as the corporation have not taken advantage of their opportunities as they might have done, nearly all the rich houses in the city have already put in private installations. The corporation cannot supply the General Post Office; they cannot supply even Dublin Castle, which is next door to the City Hall. They cannot supply any single large business establishment in Dublin, with the result that all the large business houses have put in their own private installations, and are now lost to the corporation I am afraid for ever. Under these circumstances the question is, ought a monopoly to be continued in Dublin when wholesome competition will reduce the price? The Corporation of Dublin have muddled away the electrical talents which they had; they have buried the treasure in the ground. It may not have been their fault, possibly they undertook the work too soon. Perhaps private companies managed their affairs better—I do not know how it was. Figures have been quoted by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division and by the hon. Member for St. Patrick's Division, but by whom were those figures prepared? Whose were those figures? They are the figures of the expert of the corporation who is to get a fee of £15,000 if the corporation go on with their scheme. I think I am justified in urging that figures emanating from such a source are tainted figures. Generally speaking, wherever corporations have made a success of their electric lighting, it will be found they were towns situated in the heart of the colliery districts of England or Scotland. In such places the price of coal is about four shillings per ton, whereas in Dublin at the present moment the price is twenty-four shillings per ton, and yet the case of Dublin is compared with that of Leeds or of Edinburgh. The position I take up is a simple one. A member of the Committee has stated that if it was proved that the corporation had suddenly and with a motive brought forward their scheme in opposition to that of the company, he would not be prepared to vote against this Bill. That is what has actually occurred. For over ten years complaints have been made against the corporation; it has been stated that their inactivity was due to the fact that they could not get borrowing powers. On the contrary, the corporation have plenty of power, but it never occurred to them to take any step to improve their position until this Bill was brought forward by the company. As a matter of fact, this extraordinary fact arose. Two or three years ago the corporation asked for the report of an expert, and Professor Kennedy condemned the very scheme which the corporation are now following, and they are actually going on with the scheme directly against the advice of Professor Kennedy. That is the scheme which it was now said is to be brought forward in competition with that of the Bill. If the corporation are going to spend the rates, by all means let them do so; they have the power and the authority. And if this company are prepared to spend money let them do so. My experience of electric lighting companies is that electric lighting is a very lean business; there is not so much money in it as people imagine. For one company that has succeeded, in the heart of a colliery district, there are ten which have failed elsewhere, and where one has made a profit ten have not succeeded in doing so. I think that when this matter has been dealt with by a Committee which has heard all the evidence, the House may very well allow the Bill to go on.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): As a ratepayer of the city of Dublin I would appeal to the House not to pass this Bill. I have listened, in common with many other Members, to the case made out in favour of the Bill by the chairman of the Committee, and what was the chief ground on which he based that case? He did not attempt to deny that in passing this Bill, if it is passed, the House is asked to inflict upon the city of Dublin a stigma and mark of incompetency that it does not inflict on any other city or town in the United Kingdom. The exact ground, in fact, on which he claimed that the Bill ought to be passed is that the evidence laid before the Committee had convinced him that the Corporation of the city of Dublin was unfit to be entrusted with the carrying out of the electric lighting of the city. Now I appeal to the House to hesitate and to be very slow before they do apply such a severe censure as that on the city of Dublin. The hon. Member for North Louth based some argument on the impolicy of upsetting the decision of a Committee of this House. He said if we set aside the decision of the Committee on this Bill how could the corporation complain if the decision of the Committee on the Boundaries Bill were upset by the House of Lords? I ask, could a more powerful argument be offered against the passing of the Boundaries Bill than that this House had declared by its vote that the Corporation of Dublin is so incompetent a body that they are unfit to do what every small town in this kingdom can do? That is exactly the argument on which the opponents of the Boundaries Bill have based their case; they have run down the character of the Corporation of the city of Dublin, and it would be impossible to supply the Committee of the House of Lords on the Boundaries Bill with a stronger plea for refusing to extend the boundaries of the city of Dublin than that the House of Commons had decided that that corporation was unfit to take care of the electric lighting of the city. Let me direct the attention of the House to two very remarkable clauses in this Bill—Clause 24 and Clause 25. They are very remarkable clauses. Under Clause 24 it is proposed to be enacted that—

> "Nothing contained in this Act or to be done under the provisions of this Act, or under any agreement to be made under its provisions or otherwise howsoever, shall enable the company or any other company or person to generate, transmit, supply, sell, distribute, or use electrical energy or power in any manner and any purpose whatsoever within the urban districts of Rathmines, and Rathgar and Pembroke."

And by Clause 25 it is provided that nothing in the Bill shall—

> "enable the company, or any other company or persons to generate, transact, supply, sell, distribute or use electrical energy or power in any

manner for any purpose whatsoever within the urban district of Clontarf, without the consent in writing, under the Common Seal of the Clontarf Urban District Council first had and obtained."

That is to say, you protect these small urban townships in the immediate vicinity of Dublin, and provide that the small urban district of Clontarf should not be supplied with electricity by this company without the consent in writing under the Common Seal of the Urban District Council of Clontarf; but the city of Dublin is to be placed under the heel of this company, and that company is to have power to tear up the streets of Dublin at its own street will, without the consent of the corporation. We have come down here to oppose another electric lighting scheme for the very city in which we are sitting; and one of the strong arguments in favour of that electric lighting scheme is that the vestry of Marylebone have vainly endeavoured to buy out the company, because the company ask an extravagant price. It is pointed out that under that scheme the streets may be torn up instantly on the company's own initiative. In this way Oxford Street was opened up 178 times and Marylebone Road 108 times in one year. That is a state of things to which we in Dublin shall be exposed by this Bill if it is passed. The company will open up every street in Dublin whenever they think necessary. The hon. Member for North Louth says that he is in favour of municipal trading or municipal enterprise, but that he refuses to pay 7d. to the municipality for electricity which he can get from a private company for 3d. or 4d. But by this Bill the company are to be allowed to charge in the centre of Dublin 6d. per unit for three years, and after that 5d. per unit as long as ever they like. We know that in this country many municipalities are furnishing electricity to-day at 3d. per unit; yet here we have a company which offers, as a magnificent boon, to furnish us with electricity at 6d. per unit for three years, and after that for an indefinite period at 5d.

*MR. BROWN: That is the maximum price.

MR. DILLON: Of course it is the maximum price. Unless the corporation set up a rival scheme the maximum price will remain the price, because the company will not reduce the price below the maximum unless there is competition. The hon. Gentleman says that the Dublin Corporation would be utterly unable to compete with the company. What they want is to crush out the competition of the corporation and reduce the rate to 5d. per unit, while making an enormous profit for themselves. We know, if they succeed in passing this Bill, what will happen—what always happens. The company will spend £300,000 or £400,000, and after a few years the corporation and the ratepayers of Dublin will be obliged to pay the shareholders of the company a premium of £100,000 or £150,000 to get rid of them. This Bill in the long run will turn out to be a present to a lot of private shareholders and capitalists of £100,000 or £150,000 out of the pockets of the people living in the city of Dublin, and I do therefore strongly object to this Bill. The hon. Member founded his case in favour of this Bill chiefly upon the discontent of the ratepayers of Dublin in regard to the present state of things. But where is the evidence of this discontent in Dublin? Are the Dublin Members of Parliament in favour of this Bill? We know that the Corporation of Dublin is actively opposed to this measure, and the four Members of Parliament for the city of Dublin are also opposed to it. Can the hon. Member for North Louth point to a single public meeting, or any of the ordinary forms by which the feelings of the ratepayers are brought before this House, to show that there is any widespread discontent in Dublin with the present state of things? Those supporting the measure are largely men who expect to make profits, and who are named in the Bill as promoters. I am not seeking to throw any discredit on men because they promote a company, but I repudiate the idea that they represent the feelings of the ratepayers. These men do not claim to have any philanthropic motive, and if this House is so badly advised as to pass this Bill the profits of these gentlemen will be enormous. I maintain that there is no evidence before the House—and there was none before the Committee—of any widespread dissatisfaction with the proceedings of the Corporation of Dublin. Everybody admits that the corporation has not administered some of its affairs satisfactorily, but it must be remembered that

Dublin commenced the work of electric lighting at a time when there was not a single electric lamp in London, and of course they had to suffer, made mistakes, and wasted some money. The city of Dublin was very early in the field, but the real reason why electric lighting was not a success in Dublin was because they had not got the capital at that time to do the work properly. Now they have got borrowing powers, and they have applied for a Provisional Order, and it is only justice to allow them to try and see if they cannot do this work satisfactorily. If the House does what the promoters of this Bill require, it will be inflicting a great injury on the capital city of Ireland. Whatever may have been the failings of the corporation—and I think they have been grossly exaggerated—the past history of the corporation does not justify such a proceeding. The city of Dublin now possesses a system of waterworks which is as good as any in the United Kingdom. It has established a cheap water supply, and I think it might be trusted to try what it can do with electricity. We have heard a good deal of talk about the gas company. I am no friend of the gas company in Dublin, and none of us are who have to light our houses from their supply. But what I cannot understand in the action of my hon. colleague the Member for North Louth is that he is in favour of setting up a fresh private company. If it had been in my power to oppose the gas monopoly passing into the hands of a private company I should have opposed it, for it is a wrong principle that any of these monopolies should pass into private hands. But having learned from bitter experience in the past, we ought to make that experience the motive for a firm resolution that in these common needs of the community in the future we will never allow a private company to get control. I earnestly appeal to hon. Members of this House not to inflict a great insult upon the city of Dublin by passing this measure.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 180; Noes, 167. (Division List No. 162.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bainbridge, Emerson
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Barry, RtHnAHSmith-(Hunts
Barry, Sir FrancisT.(Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beach, Rt.Hn.W.W.B.(Hants
Biddulph, Michael
Bill, Charles
Birrell, Augustine
Blakiston-Houston, John
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt.H.F.(Middlesex
Bowles, T.Gibson(King'sLynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H.
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHnJ.A.(Glasgow
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,J Austen(Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chelsea, Viscount
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw.H.Athole
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Cornwallis,FiennesStanleyW.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. E. T. D.
Courtney,Rt.Hon.Leonard H.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Drage, Geoffrey
Dyke,Rt.Hn.SirWilliam Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ(Manc'r
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs,Hn.A.G.H.(CityofLond
Gibney, James
Gilliat, John Saunders
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Gunter, Colonel
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton,Rt.Hn.Lord George
Hamond,Sir Chas.(Newcastle)
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hardy, Laurence
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Thomas J. (Wexford)
Henderson, Alexander
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jessel, Captain Herbert M.
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez E.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence,SirE Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lea,Sir Thomas (Londonderry
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.
Llewelyn,SirDillwyn-(Sw'nsea
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Liverpool
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum’land)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macaleese, Daniel
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W)
M‘Killop, James
Manners, Lord Edward Wm. J.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Marks, Henry Hananel
Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Yorks)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milbank, Sir Powlett C. J.
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morris, Samuel
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptf’rd
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry

Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O’Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs. Newton)
Plunkett, Rt. Hn. Horace C.
Rankin, Sir James
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Cheltenham
Rutherford, John
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Savory, Sir Joseph
Seely, Charles Hilton
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Sir H. M. (Lambeth)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.

Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G (Oxf’d Univ.)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffld
Walrond, Rt. Hon Sir W. H.
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
Wrightson, Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyvill, Marmaduke D’Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Arthur O’Connor and
Mr. T. M. Healy

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Aird, John
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Baker, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Billson, Alfred
Blake, Edward
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Charles (Glasgow)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colville John
Crombie, John William
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmot, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (South’ton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William (Dublin)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Galloway, William Johnson
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gold, Charles
Gourley, Sir E. Temperley
Gurdon, Sir William B.
Harrington, Timothy
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
Heaton, John Henniker
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Helder, Augustus
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hogan, James Francis
Holden, Sir Angus
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houston, R. P.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.
Kenyon, James
Kinloch, Sir John George S.
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Laurie, Lieut -General
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Macdona, John Cumming
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qu’n’s C
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclean, James Mackenzie
Maclure, Sir John William

M‘Crae, George
M‘Ghee, Richard
M‘Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
M‘Kenna, Reginald
Maddison, Fred.
Malcolm, Ian
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Hon. J. S. (Hants.)
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Moss, Samuel
Murnaghan, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O’Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O’Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O’Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O Dowd, John
O’Kelly, James
O’Malley, William
Palmer, George W. (Reading)
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Rentoul, J. Alexander
Roberts, John H. (Denbigh.)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, H. S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)

Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wason, Eugene
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.)
Wilson, Frederick W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfld
Wyndham, George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Carew and Sir Albert Rollit.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill considered.

Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time.

OLDHAM CORPORATION BILL (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): In moving the clause which stands in my name, I have no quarrel whatever with the promoters of this Bill. They asked for this very clause, and my quarrel is with those who have prevented their getting the clause they desired. The clause which stands on the Paper in my name is not my own drafting; it is taken from the Leeds Corporation Bill of last year. I may therefore call it the Leeds clause. I do not want to raise the whole question of the milk clause, or whether inspection is a good thing. That has nothing to do with the point I am raising. My point is a very small one. It is simply the question of what licence or warrant should be held to justify the invasion of the district of one local authority by the inspectors of another local authority. On that particular point, which is the whole issue between us, the difference between the clause in the Bill and the Leeds clause is simply that the former allows such an invasion on the authority of one justice, while the Leeds clause provides that the petty sessions should be required to authorise such a raid, and it must be proved that the outside authority, in whose jurisdiction the dairy is, has not done its duty. I do not lay any stress on the difference between one justice and two justices. The important point of difference is that the system in the Bill contemplates each corporation acting for itself by its own inspectors raiding outside districts, whereas the clause I propose suggests that the municipality should get what it wants by compelling the outside authority to do its duty, and should only itself act in default of the proper local authority. If we look at the object to be attained, we shall see at once which of these two roads is the better road by which to attain that object. Our object is to prevent consumption by human beings of milk from cows suffering from tuberculosis. If municipalities act by their own inspectors they can stop the consumption of that milk only in their own boroughs, whereas if we can induce the outside authority, in whose district the dairy with the suspected cow is, to act, they can stop the consumption of the milk in any part of the country. There is power under the Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops' Order, as amended last year, by which every authority can stop the mixing of such milk with other milk, and prevent the use or sale of that milk for human food, If the corporations, or any one of them, by having such power as I propose to give to Oldham, can, by threatening to take steps if it does not do its duty, induce the outside authority, in whose district are condemned cows, to do its duty, they will save not only their own constituents but the whole human race from the danger arising from the consumption of the milk of these tuberculous cows. Surely that is a result which is very desirable, and by the system which I suggest this could be done without friction between local authorities. If a local authority is in default it cannot complain if another authority sends its inspectors into its district. If an authority is in default it cannot be hard for another authority to say "You shall not affect our citizens." But where a local authority is not in default, it cuts at the very foundation of the principles of local self-government that its district should be invaded by the inspectors of another authority. If the proper authority will act, that is, the authority in whose district the disease is, we can get by one inspector what, under the system proposed in the Bill, would require the joint action of the inspectors representing every local area in England. If we work as the Bill suggests we should, 500 inspectors may have to inspect the same cow, and institute 500 prosecutions with regard to that animal. The farmers of England do not desire knowingly to sell milk from cows suffering from tuberculosis of the udder. But even if they did, or if they were ignorant, either the Leeds clause or the model clause would stop them. This is not then a farmers' question, but the farmers have a right to ask that, if we can reach our destination equally well by either of two roads, we should choose that road which trespasses least on them. By the clause I am proposing, we should embarass the farmer the least, we should stop the sale of his milk by one inspection, and we should do it better, more quickly, and more wisely. I have only one other point to make. We are told, not by the corporations, not by the county councils, not by the urban or sanitary authorities, not by the outside authorities, and not by the farmers, but by a certain gentleman at the Local Government Board, that these "model clauses" as they are called, are sacred, and must be put into every Bill brought forward by a corporation asking for powers to deal with this important matter of the milk supply. These model clauses are supposed to derive their sacred character from the fact that they were agreed upon at a conference. I was there, and I know what that understanding arrived at was. If it was being loyally carried out in spirit and letter I should have nothing to say. The origin of that conference was that certain corporations last year brought in private Bills containing clauses calculated to secure that there should be no danger from the consumption of English milk. Under these there would have been no English milk to consume. The agricultural Members naturally threatened to oppose such an attack on their constituents by every means within the rules of civilised political warfare. The promoters of the private Bills appealed to the God of Health in the shape of the President of the Local Government Board. We invoked the aid of the patron saint of farmers—the President of the Board of Agriculture. By the intervention of these two high authorities a conference was arranged at which everybody was represented except the outside authorities whose districts were to be invaded by the inspectors of other authorities, and whose authority was to be flouted. At that conference a compromise was arranged. In that as in every compromise the peaceful people like the Member for South Somerset and myself gave way a great deal, and the aggressive corporation agents yielded something. Clauses called model clauses were agreed on, and we who represent the rural districts agreed that we would not oppose the Bills if the powers of inspection and prosecution were cut down within the limits of the model clauses. In return we understood that the Local Government Board would assist us in opposing any Bills which asked for greater powers than were contained in those clauses. Everybody understood that the powers in those clauses were to be the maximum powers which the corporations might have either inside or outside their own places, not the minimum powers which they must have. The grievance which the representatives of the farmers, or of urban, rural or district councils, or county councils, complain of is that the Local Government Board has thrown all its weight into the scale against them before the Police and Sanitary Committee. The Local Government Board will not allow corporations, for the sake of peace with their less powerful but quite as sensitive and sensible brother authorities, to ask for powers of invasion less drastic than those of the model clauses. They must be forced to abandon their own peaceable proposals, drop their clauses, and take instead the model clauses as to invasion which are sure to produce friction. Oldham, for instance, asked for the Leeds clause, which I have shown is as good for preventing danger from milk, and far better in preventing friction with farmers. On account of certain objections of the Local Government Board, Oldham has been refused these moderate powers, and has been compelled to take the full powers of the model clauses. Against that I appeal to the House, and I move the reinsertion of the clause that was in the Bill.

A clause (Limitation of powers outside borough)—(*Mr. Grant Lawson*)—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time," put.

*MR. MCKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I rise for the purpose of explaining what was the action of the Police and Sanitary Committee, before which this Bill came. So far as I am aware the description the hon. and learned Gentleman has given of the relations between the Police and Sanitary Committee and the Local Government Board is quite fanciful, and certainly it is not according to my recollection of what occurred in respect to the history of these clauses. He rightly stated that the issue between this clause which he proposes to introduce, called the Leeds clause, and the clauses as they now stand in the Bill is a very simple one, but nevertheless I trust the House will bear with me while I endeavour to show that the issue, though simple, is really very important. Upon the merits of the milk clauses there is no dispute on either side. The Committee, who had all the evidence before them, came unanimously to the conclusion that if the Leeds clause were adopted instead of the clauses which now stand in the Bill the same end would not be served. Let me explain shortly the difference between them. The object of the milk clauses is to prevent the sale of contaminated milk for human consumption within the borough. In order to effect that object the clauses provide for the inspection of cowsheds whence the milk comes, whether inside or outside the borough. They also provide for inquiry, and for power to the corporation to compel any person supplying milk from an infected cow to show cause why an order should not be made against him in order to prevent the continuance of that supply. So long as the milk is supplied from within the borough it is quite clear that the proper authority to enforce the law would be the corporation. The difficulty is when the milk comes from outside. Three classes are then affected. First of all there are the consumers; then there are the purveyors of the milk—the farmers and dairymen; and then there are the local authorities. I wish to show very shortly that so far as the purveyors are concerned they will be better off under the clauses as they now stand than under the Leeds clause. It is quite obvious that the general effect of the milk clauses would be to set the law in operation on mere suspicion. When there is no real cause for the suspicion against a farmer or dairyman it is desirable that as little notoriety should be given to that suspicion as possible. If you make the officer act on the order of one justice there will be very little harm to the farmer in the event, after investigation, of its being found that there was no case of tuberculosis in his dairy. In the case of a single justice granting the order the inspection would take place immediately; but if you have to get an order from justices in petty sessions it means delay of a fortnight or a month, and during that interval the farmer is under suspicion. It is impossible to keep that suspicion private, and consequently if the Leeds clause were adopted you would run the risk of doing an injury to a farmer who, as a matter of fact, had no case of contamination in his dairy. The Committee came to the conclusion that so far as the farmer was concerned it would undoubtedly be better that the inspection should take place quickly on the order of one justice, and not wait until the case had been inquired into in court after a delay of a fortnight or a month. The second class concerned are the local authorities. The Committee desire to respect, and I believe the Local Government Board also desire to respect, the independence of local authorities. But the independence of the outside authorities would be interfered with, whether the Leeds clause be adopted or the existing clauses retained. The only question between us is whether the independence of the local authorities should be interfered with on the order of one Justice or of two Justices in petty sessions. The Committee were convinced, by the evidence they heard, of the overwhelming importance of the milk clauses. If it is desired that they should be carried into effect it is of extreme importance that the procedure under which they are to be put into use shall be as quick and simple as possible. What is the procedure proposed by the Leeds clause? You have first of all to get the order of two justices sitting in petty sessions, which means delay and notoriety. Before the justices can issue their order they have to be satisfied that the local authority of the district has not dealt with the case, and I would ask hon. Members familiar with the procedure of the Court how that evidence can be got. It is proposed that the justices shall not have power to issue an order until they are satisfied "that the local authority of the said district has not already dealt with the case, or, having power to deal with the case, has been requested by the corporation to deal with it, and has neglected or declined to do so." The Committee went into the details of the Leeds clause, and they were satisfied if that clause was introduced into the Bill it would be practically impossible for the corporation ever to get an order outside the borough, or, if they did get it, it would be after such an extreme lapse of time that its practical effect would be very slight. Under these circumstances the Committee decided that, the point in dispute being merely a question of the ground upon which outside interference should take place, the case was established for allowing the clauses as they now stand to be accepted, and the Committee have in every case brought before them adopted the same clauses. The hon. and learned Gentleman said he was only asking for the corporation what they originally desired. The hon. Gentleman has been misinformed on that point. The corporation desired the model clauses, but were threatened with opposition, and in order to meet the opposition they agreed to introduce the Leeds clause, and on that the opposition was withdrawn. The corporation have acted loyally on their undertaking, and have not taken any steps to suggest the acceptance by the House or the Committee of the model clauses, but as a matter of fact they desired the model clauses and not the Leeds clause to appear in their Bill. This is the third time this question has been raised in this House this session. On one occasion there was a division and on the other occasions no division, but in each case the opposition has arisen from precisely the same quarter, and although I do not blame the hon. Gentlemen for taking every step in their power, I trust the House will not be misled into thinking that there is any really substantial opposition to the model clauses.

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): The hon. Member has spoken as if the Corporation of Oldham were opposed to the insertion of the model clauses by the Committee which considered the Bill. I wish to state, on account of representations made to me within the last day or two, that that is quite incorrect. They put the Leeds clause in the original form of the Bill, not because they liked it, but because opposition was threatened. Now, after the other clauses have been inserted, they have the strongest desire that they should remain there. I unhesitatingly oppose on public grounds the Amendment of the hon. Member opposite. In the first place, I prefer the model clauses to the Leeds clause. In the second place, I think the Committee are perfectly right in trying to secure uniformity on this matter. Further, on behalf of the constituency I represent I ask that they should not be put in a worse position than other towns which have had Bills before Parliament this session. The hon. and learned Member drew a picture of a splendid milker which had been visited by 500 inspectors.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: Not all at the same time.

*MR. EMMOTT: Well, I leave that point. I wish to point out in conclusion that the attack of the hon. and learned Member, which is nominally on the Local Government Board, is practically an attack on a Committee of this House which I think has done splendid work. I earnestly hope that the House will support the decision of the Committee.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I understood the hon. Member to say that the proposal of the Oldham Corporation was to put in the Leeds clause. I had my attention drawn to the original Bill at the beginning of the session, and I can state that they did not put in the Leeds clause, but put in something of their own. That is what we objected to, and my hon. friend very truly said that the model clauses were drawn up to prevent this wholesale inspection without the authority of the justices having jurisdiction in the locality, giving power to the medical officer and the inspector to go and see the premises. I hope that my hon. friend, after hearing this, will withdraw the motion.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: I am not at all inclined to accept this version of what happened in the Oldham Bill. In the Report of the Standing Committee it is expressly stated that the promoters desired to have these clauses.

MR. STRACHEY (Somerset, S.) said this was a question of centralisation or decentralisation. He quite admitted that there might be a case for interference where the local authorities had a dispute in this matter, but where the local authorities were found to be absolutely agreed he could not see why the Local Government Board should come and interfere. He could not understand why the procedure of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, had not been adopted in regard to the inspection of dairies and the sale of milk. The right of appeal, such as the hon. Member for Thirsk wished, was provided for in Clause 60 of that Act. He could not see why the Local Government Board denied in England the right of appeal which had already been granted in Scotland.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.) said this was not a question of centralisation or decentralisation. It was nothing more nor less than a question of public health, and he hoped the hon. and learned Member would proceed no further with his opposition.

Question put, and negatived.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH.)

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [Lords].

Ordered, that the Bills be read a second time.

Mr. Strachey.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO NOT COMPLIED WITH.)

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have not been complied with, viz.:—

North British Railway Bill [Lords].

Ordered, that the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

BREWERY AND COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT TRUST BILL [Lords].

BRISTOL WATER BILL [Lords].

COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE COMPANY BILL [Lords].

MILFORD DOCKS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

BRAY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

ROCHDALE CORPORATION BILL.

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

TAFF VALE RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Not amended, considered; to be read the third time.

GWYRFAI RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL WATER BILL [Lords] (BY ORDER).

Read a second time, and committed.

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT).

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lafone and Mr. Wanklyn.

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

LONDON COUNTY TRAMWAYS (No. 1) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

CROYDON TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section A), with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

GUN BARREL PROOF ACT, 1868, AMENDMENT BILL [Lords].

Reported [Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

EAST STIRLINGSHIRE WATER BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

Colonel GUNTER reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills, That the parties opposing the Edinburgh Corporation Bill had stated that the evidence of Thomas Bryce Laing, Town Clerk of Leith, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Thomas Bryce Laing do attend the said Committee To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Thomas Bryce Laing do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

Sir FREDERICK GODSON reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills, That the parties opposing the Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill had stated that the evidence of Frederick J. Dick, Thomas Crossthwaite, and Allen Hornsby was essential to their case; and it having been proved that their attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Frederick J. Dick, Thomas Crossthwaite, and Allen Hornsby do attend the said Committee, and produce all maps, plans, diagrams, estimates, reports, records, and statistics, and other documents, whatsoever in any way relating to the above Bill, on Tuesday, 3rd July, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Frederick J. Dick, Thomas Crossthwaite, and Allen Hornsby do attend the Committee on Group K of Private Bills on Tuesday, 3rd July, at half-past Eleven of the clock, and produce the said documents.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee:—

1. "That in the case of the Muirkirk, Mauchline, and Dalmellington Railways (Abandonment) Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

3. "That, in the case of Roe's Patent Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

4. "That, in the case of the North-Eastern Railway Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolutions agreed to.

NORTH-EASTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Metropolitan Common Scheme (Petersham) Provisional Order Bill, Morecambe Urban District Council (Gas) Bill.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Great Berkhampstead Water Bill [Lords], Motherwell Water Bill [Lords], Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer powers upon the Corporation of the borough of South Shields for the construction of street works and improvements; and for other purposes." South Shields Corporation Bill [Lords].

SOUTH SHIELDS CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

BRITISH MUSEUM BILL.

Petition of the Library Association, for reference to a Select Committee; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Brechin, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MIDWIVES BILL.

Petition from Manchester, against; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Petition from Birmingham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Enstone; Somercotes; Belper; Handforth; Aldershot; Billinghay; Beeston; Sandbach; Northwich; Frodsham; and Hastings; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Heywood, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Leeds (three); Carlisle; Hampstead; Banbury; York; Gospel Oak; Oldbury; Worcester; Bath (eight); West Ham; Stroud Green; Sheffield; South Cave; Gainsborough (two); Masborough; Kimberworth (two); Rotherham (three); Bishop Norton; Malling; Newton Heath; Newcastle-upon-Tyne (two); Coventry; Heywood; Ashton-under-Lyne (two); Colne; Enstone; Ightham; Nottingham (three); Devonport; Winterley; Widnes; Maesteg; Alford; Briton Ferry; Pontycymmer; Whaplode; Cadoxton juxta Neath; Coedfranc; Wakeham; Belper; Glasshouses; South Hornsey (three); East Finchley; Whitehaven; Crosscoombe; Weymouth (two); Egremont; Dorchester; Broadway; Carlisle; Balderton: Northampton; Cwmbran; Salford; Bristol; Clapham; Gunnislake; Ambleston; Walworth (three); Maryport (two); Six Hills; East Birmingham; Little Addington; Carnforth; Eston; Battersea; Geddington; Litherland; Doncaster (four); Tow Law (three); Lanehead; Penzance; Billy Row; Cumberland: Balby; St. Just (three); St. Martin's (Scilly); St. Agnes (Scilly); Mexborough; Westgate; Bray; Hull; Berkshire; Hastings; Thorne (three); Boston; Great Yarmouth; Gerards Cross; Newark Road; Austerfield; Cheshire; Camberwell; Bawtry; Frodsham; Todmorden; Maidenhead (two); Walton-on-the-Naze; Marylebone; Regent's Park; Kiveton Park; Wokingham; Ramsbury; Bracebridge; Ripon; and, Lincoln (twenty-nine); to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL AND SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petition from Lancashire and Cheshire, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL; SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL; AND SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Llansamlet, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Dundonald; Portpatrick; Campbeltown; Earlston; Aberdeen; and Douglas Water; to lie upon the Table.

SMALLER DWELLINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of Association of Burgh Officials of Scotland, against; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petition from Monmouth, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour; from Parkgate; Chester; Reading (ten); Saffron Walden; York; Watford; Ashton-under-Lyne; Burslem; Southampton; Oldbury; St. Austell; Manchester; Bishop Norton; Keadby (two); Nottingham (two); Kidderminster; Magon; Bargoed; Weston-super-Mare (two); Newport; Coventry (two); Widnes; Birmingham (two); Southend-on-Sea; Carnforth; Buckfastleigh (four); Blaengarw; Coedfranc; Cadoxton juxta Neath; Wakeham; Upper Tooting; Exeter; Ripon; Glasshouses; Stroud Green; Rochdale; Crosscoombe; Tolskithy; Four Lanes; Portreath; Pool; Redruth; South Downs; Weymouth; Summerfield; Dorchester; Weymouth; Broadway; Sandback (two); Doncaster (five); Bawtry; Pontefract; Crook; Aldershot; Radcliffe-on-Trent; Newark; Sunderland; Dovercourt; Leicester; Leytonstone; Yardley; Darlington (ten); Melsonby; Eppleby; Aldborough; Barking; Plymouth; Gunnislake; Ambleston; Sixhills; North Thoresby; Tetney; Lavender Hill; Eston; Redcar; Battersea; Clapham; Bulwell; Lane Head; Tow Law; Rotherham; Mytholmroyd; Frodsham; Todmorden; Heywood; Crosskeys; Fleur-de-Lis; Balby; Mansfield; Royston; Wokingham; Bradford (five); Austerfield; St. Just (three); St. Agnes (Scilly); Bristol; Stithians; Burrows; Kidderminster; Bischcliffe; Sowerby Bridge; Lincoln; Woodhouse Grove; Great Yarmouth; Lantwardine; Penzance; St. Martin's (Scilly); and Hastings; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Blaengarw; Pontycymmer (two); Coedfranc; Cadoxton-juxta-Neath; and Ambleston; to lie upon the Table.

TRUSTS FUNDS BILL.

Petition from Birmingham, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COUNTY TREASURERS' FEE FUND (IRELAND).

Account presented, for the year ended 25th March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th June; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 234.]

LEAD POISONING.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 22nd June; *Mr. Jesse Collings*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 235.]

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report No. 293 (Bermuda, Annual Report for 1899) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report, No. 292 (British New Guinea, Annual Report for 1898–9, [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Public Records (Court of Exchequer).—Copy of a Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents connected with actions arising out of seizures of goods, etc., or for the recovery of penalties under Acts relating to the Customs or Excise, and other Process in matters relating to the Revenue, which formerly were or ought to have been in the Office of the King's or Queen's Remembrancer of the Exchequer, and which are now in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act].

MADRAS LAND REVENUE.

Ordered, That so much of the Return relative to Madras Land Revenue, which was presented 8th August, 1899, as relates to the despatch from the Secretary of State for India, with enclosures reviewing correspondence regarding sales of defaulters' lands in Madras, be printed. [No. 236.]

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY OF ENGLAND.

Copy ordered, "of Account showing the figures upon which the grant of £2,500 per annum, made in aid of the expenses incurred by the Incorporated Law Society of England in the performance of the duties of discipline imposed upon them by the Act 51 and 52 Vic. c. 65, is based."—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 237.]

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—TREATMENT OF CAPE REBELS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can say when he expects to be in a position to lay upon the Table Papers respecting the communications which have been recently passing between Her Majesty's Government and the Cape Ministries as to the policy to be pursued as regards those charged with acts of rebellion, and particularly whether the Minute of the Schreiner Ministry upon the subject will be included in the Papers.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I am not in a position to say. I am in communication with the present Cape Ministers on the subject.

ADMINISTRATION OF MARTIAL LAW.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state what, in the areas in South Africa where martial law has been proclaimed, was the number of persons arrested under its provisions up to 31st May; how many of these had been brought to trial, and how many had been convicted or acquitted; whether, and, if so, in how many cases had the intervention of the Supreme Court been invoked, and with what result; whether, and, if so, in how many cases had persons arrested been discharged by the military authorities after conviction and sentence, after appeal had been made to the Supreme Court, but irrespective of any actual judgment on its part; and how many persons had been discharged without being brought to trial.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I am not in a position to give the detailed information for which the hon. Member asks. Perhaps, however, I may explain the course which has been pursued. On the outbreak of war Sir A. Milner inquired by cable whether the administration of martial law was to be based on the principles embodied in a circular issued by the Colonial Office for the guidance of governors in 1867. The Colonial Office replied in the affirmative. Two further memorandums were drawn up indicating the proper application of these principles to cases which were likely to arise, and the three documents were circulated to officers charged with the administration of martial law in South Africa. Such documents are and must be merely advisory. The safeguards of justice in martial law must be sought in the good sense, and humanity of those charged with its administration. On 9th March the Secretary of State directed Lord Roberts to furnish records of all proceedings, so that the War Office might have the advantage of the experience gained during the only recent, and by far the most extensive, application of martial law. But these particulars have not yet reached us.

INOCULATION AGAINST TYPHOID FEVER.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he has any information to enable him to give statistics as to the effect of inoculation against typhoid fever in South Africa.

The following questions also appeared on the Paper:—

MR. WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): To ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to say whether the troops who submitted themselves to inoculation, who are now serving in South Africa, and have had enteric fever, have had it in a less mild degree than those who have not been inoculated; and what proportion of those inoculated recovered.

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY (Bath): To ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether medical records have been kept during the South African War and are already available which would show the results of inoculation in the prevention of enteric fever among the troops; whether it has been found that among those inoculated there has been immunity from the disease; and, in the event of the reports on inoculation not showing such immunity, can he state what are the results of comparisons up to a certain date between the cases of those admitted to hospital suffering from this disease who had been inoculated and those who had not been so treated.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I will reply at the same time to the questions put by the hon. Member for Clackmannan and Kinross and my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Bath: Medical records showing the results of inoculation are being compiled in South Africa, but the statistics at present available are not sufficient to enable me to give a conclusive reply to the questions. I doubt whether it will be possible to report on this question before the end of the war.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Are the troops now going out inoculated?

*MR. WYNDHAM: It is optional with them. Facilities are given them to undergo it, but no compulsion is used.

CHINA — ANTI-FOREIGN DISTURBANCES—JAPANESE ASSISTANCE IN SUPPRESSION.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Her Majesty's Government will arrange with the Government of Japan, the only Power able to act without delay, to at once send an adequate land force to suppress the disturbances in China.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): It is undesirable to state the nature of negotiations which may be proceeding. Her Majesty's Government would welcome the despatch of troops by any Power which, owing to the proximity of its troops, may be able to act at once for the suppression of disturbances in North China.

RECENT OPERATIONS—TIENTSIN AND PEKING.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Has the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs any news from China which he can communicate to the House?

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (MR. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): We have no direct news from the legations, Admiral Seymour's force, or Tientsin. Our last information from the officer in charge at Wei-hai-wei is that 3,000 men of the relief force at Tientsin were encamped within nine miles of that place on the evening of June 23rd. The force comprised Russians, French, Japanese, and British. From private sources we are informed that the relief force subsequently entered Tientsin and marched north. Statements have reached us from various Chinese sources that the legations were all unharmed on the 20th instant.

ADMIRAL SEYMOUR'S ACTION.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state whether Admiral Seymour withdrew from the China Squadron under his command himself and the 900 men landed from that squadron and undertook the land expedition to Peking by virtue of discretionary powers given to him, or did he so act in consequence of orders to that effect from the Admiralty; what proportion of the fighting men of the China Squadron do the 900 men represent; have any steps been taken for replacing these men by others; and, if so, when will those others probably reach the squadron.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The Vice-Admiral's suggestion that he should take command of the expedition, a step to which he believed most or all of the foreign officers present would assent, was approved by the Admiralty, if an agreement was arrived at locally. My hon. friend speaks of the Admiral withdrawing himself from his squadron. That is not exactly the way in which to describe an expedition hurried off with the utmost energy to secure the legations and the European residents at Peking. 736 men were landed with the admiral from certain ships of the squadron on the China station, and the total complements of the ships on the station number about 7,000. As already announced, the transport "Jelunga" has been engaged to convey to the China station 860 ratings. She will sail about the 30th June.

COMPOSITION OF ADMIRAL SEYMOUR'S NAVAL FORCE ON LAND.

*Sir J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he has yet been able to ascertain what is the strength and composition of the British naval force up country in China with Admiral Seymour; from what ships have the officers and men of the force been drawn for such land service; and whether they were supernumerary to or formed part of the complements necessary to provide for the fighting efficiency of the ships.

Mr. GOSCHEN: The naval force which formed part of the forces under Admiral Seymour is believed to consist of 736 men drawn from the "Centurion," "Endymion," and "Aurora," but the information at present in the possession of the Admiralty is not sufficient to enable details to be given. The officers and men in question formed part of the complements of the ships.

*Sir J. COLOMB: All taken out of these three ships?

Mr. GOSCHEN: Yes.

COMMAND OF THE ALLIED FORCES.

*Sir J. COLOMB: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, as a consequence of the absence of the senior British Admiral up country in China while at the head of International forces on land, the Russian Admiral has become the senior officer and head of the International forces on the water; and whether this state of things arises from orders sent by, or through, the Admiralty to the Admiral to leave his Fleet and proceed up country for land operations.

Mr. GOSCHEN: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative, and the second part has been dealt with by my answer to the question of the hon. Member for King's Lynn.

BRITISH LAND FORCES FOR TIENTSIN.

Sir E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state who commands the British land forces and other land forces now being despatched to the relief of Tientsin.

*Mr. BRODRICK: A telegram from the Rear-Admiral forwarded from Chefoo on 23rd June stated that a Russian major-general with a German officer second in command, and Captain Warrender of Her Majesty's Ship "Barfleur" are in charge of the operations from the Ta-ku forts for the relief of Tientsin.

CHINESE TRADE IN BRITISH SHIPS.

Mr. DRAGE (Derby): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what are the latest figures received by the Foreign Office with regard to the percentage of the total Chinese trade carried by British ships, and the percentage which they pay of the total receipts of the Chinese customs.

*Mr. BRODRICK: The percentage of the number of vessels engaged in the foreign trade of China in 1899 was—British, 61; other countries, 39; and as regards the value of the goods carried—British, 53; other countries, 47; and the percentage of duties paid on such goods was—British, 59; other countries, 41.

BRITISH INTERESTS IN THE YANG-TSZE VALLEY.

Mr. DRAGE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what are the latest figures received by the Foreign Office with regard to the number and tonnage of British ships employed in the trade of the Yang-tsze Valley, and what is the percentage of British shipping so employed as compared with the foreign and Chinese ships in the same trade.

*Mr. BRODRICK: The latest year for which complete returns as to the shipping trade of the Yang-tsze can be given is 1898. In that year the number of British ships entered and cleared at the Treaty ports of the Yang-tsze Kiang was 10,753 with a tonnage of 12,271,892. Of the total tonnage of all shipping entered and cleared 27 per cent. was Chinese, 61 per cent. was British, and 12 per cent. other foreign.

Mr. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government are taking any measures to safeguard British interests within the sphere of the Yang-tsze Valley.

*Mr. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir.

Mr. HEDDERWICK: Can the right hon. Gentleman, with due regard to the public interest, say more?

*Mr. BRODRICK: I have already answered a question on the subject this afternoon.

Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether appeals have been made from Cheng King and Ning-po for the protection of British gunboats; and, if so, whether these have been disregarded in consequence of none being immediately available; and whether Her Majesty's Government are taking steps to further augment our naval forces in the Yang-tsze region with the least possible delay.

*Mr. BRODRICK: Appeals have been made from various ports to Her Majesty's consuls to send ships. As I have already stated to the House, considerable reinforcements have been ordered to our naval forces in the Yang-tsze region for protection of life and property, but it would be undesirable to state the exact movements of the ships.

TIENTSIN-NEU-CHWANG RAILWAY.

Mr. JOSEPH WALTON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a gunboat has been sent to Neu-Chwang to protect the property and lives of British subjects; and whether, as early as practicable, Her Majesty's Government will station armed guards along the Tientsin-Neu-Chwang Railway to prevent the further destruction of the line.

*Mr. BRODRICK: The officers on the spot have been given full discretion, and will, we have every confidence, do their utmost for the protection of life and property. But I cannot pledge them to any particular measures.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR CHINA.

Mr. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if the 16,000 men stated to have been withdrawn from the Indian establishment include the native battalions stationed in Mauritius, Central Africa, Uganda, Hong Kong, etc.; if, since these figures were published, material increase has been made in the force under orders for China, and what is now the total strength of that force.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing): The 16,000 men stated to have been withdrawn from the Indian establishment included the battalions stationed in the Mauritius, Ceylon, Singapore, and Hong Kong. There are some Indian soldiers in Central Africa and Uganda, but they are not part of the regular Indian establishment. Some addition has been made to the force going to China, but I cannot as yet give the exact numbers.

Mr. MACLEAN: Has the number of English officers attached to the infantry battalions been increased?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I cannot say the exact number of officers accompanying the native regiments, but I understand that some addition has been made to the ordinary establishment.

ORIGIN AND WARNINGS OF THE ANTI-FOREIGN MOVEMENT.

Mr. MACLEAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office received information beforehand from Sir Claude MacDonald, or any other source, warning Her Majesty's Government to be prepared for a rising against foreigners in China.

*Mr. BRODRICK: Her Majesty's Government received reports with regard to the Boxer movement in Shantung and Chihli, but no indication of any general rising against foreigners was contained in the information which reached them prior to the recent movement of the Boxers.

DUAL (NAVAL AND MILITARY) ORGANISATION OF NAVAL STATIONS.

*SIR J. COLOMB: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Defence Committee of the Cabinet will carefully consider the present dual, naval and military, organisations of our distant naval stations, in view of the fact, illustrated by events in China, that our Admirals commanding such stations are, under the existing system, compelled to deprive their ships of fighting force when any emergency necessitates minor military operations on land, by reason of the garrisons at their bases being purely military, under the control of the War Office at home, and not at the disposal of the Admirals on the stations.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No information that we have received from China would indicate that there is any basis for the contention of my hon. and gallant friend.

ARMY—EDUCATION OF OFFICERS' SONS.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE: (Huddersfield): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War will he explain why officers of the Auxiliary forces who give their services to the country voluntarily are called upon to pay fees for their sons at the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich and the Royal Military College at Sandhurst nearly four times the amount of those paid by officers of the Regular forces; and can he, as some recognition of their services, see his way to recommend a diminution of these fees in favour of Volunteer officers who have served the State for a definite period.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The State by diminution of fees contributes towards the education of the sons of officers who have made the Army their profession, and more especially of those in the lower ranks. There are not the same grounds for making the concession in the case of Volunteer officers.

RIFLE RANGES.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the great and increasing range of modern weapons, any special officer or committee is advising the Secretary of State as to the compulsory acquisition for the nation of any sites likely to be of service for the purpose.

*MR. WYNDHAM: A Committee which deals with questions of this kind is already in existence.

CADET CORPS AND RIFLE CLUBS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, if, having regard to the desire in portions of the country to establish cadet corps and rifle clubs with a view to the preparation of boys and young men for the use of the rifle in the case of national necessity, the Secretary of State will consider the formation of a special department to draw up rules for such cadet corps and rifle clubs, and to provide for their encouragement, efficiency, and periodical inspection.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Regulations for cadet corps are already in existence, and are contained in the Volunteer regulations. Rifle clubs are to be affiliated to and placed under the supervision of the National Rifle Association. There does not, therefore, appear to be any need for the special Department suggested.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): Then is it intended that the rifle clubs shall be managed entirely by themselves, independently of the War Office?

*MR. WYNDHAM: They will be entirely voluntary associations for the practice of rifle shooting, and will receive certain facilities from the Government. They stand in no need of disciplinary rules.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): Is any encouragement to be afforded for the establishment of cadet corps?

*MR. WYNDHAM: My hon. and gallant friend will find the facilities laid down in the Volunteer regulations.

MR. TOMLINSON: Surely a certain amount of discipline is required, even in rifle practice.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I believe that the National Rifle Association have succeeded in conducting competitions at Bisley for years without any necessity for intervention on our part.

RESERVE SQUADRONS — PAY OF ACTING QUARTERMASTERS AND ADJUTANTS.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will explain why no extra duty pay has been allowed to officers acting as quartermaster and adjutant in the Reserve squadron in Ireland, although such extra pay has been granted to officers performing corresponding duties in the squadrons in England.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The grant of extra duty pay depends upon the size of the squadrons and the quantity of work thrown upon the officers, not upon their geographical distribution. The first two squadrons which reached such a size as to justify the grant happened to be in England. The limit fixed is 400 men or 250 horses; wherever and whenever this is reached the extra duty pay is given.

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT CASUALTIES.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state how many cases of sunstroke in connection with the Aldershot review have been treated in hospital, what was the average duration of their stay, and whether any of the cases were reported as severe or dangerous; and whether the principal medical officer at Aldershot was consulted as to the propriety or otherwise of holding the field day on 11th June.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The total number of cases was sixty-two; the duration of stay in hospital of those discharged was ten days; fourteen are still in hospital. Twenty-nine of the cases were considered severe. The General Officer commanding did not consult the principal medical officer, or was there ground for doing so, since exceptional heat was not anticipated.

ARMY VETERINARY DEPARTMENT—OFFICERS' TITLES.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can now state what decision has been arrived at as regards the granting of military titles without prefix to officers of the Army Veterinary Department, seeing that the question has now been long under consideration, and that the decision is anxiously awaited by the members of the veterinary profession both in and outside the service.

*MR. WYNDHAM: It has been decided to await the conclusion of the war in South Africa before coming to a decision.

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS AND GOOD CONDUCT BADGES.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state whether a man who left the service after seven years with three good conduct badges, and completed his time with the A, B, C sections, and was serving on D section when called up, is entitled to increased pay and pension on that account.

*MR. WYNDHAM: A soldier on rejoining the colours would resume the good conduct pay which he was drawing on going to the Reserve. The rate of pension is not affected by good conduct badges. I may add that no man could have three good conduct badges after only seven years service.

VOLUNTEER QUARTERMASTER SERGEANT.

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether an orderly room sergeant of Volunteers, who after six years service as such has attained the rank of quartermaster sergeant, will receive pay during encampment in accordance with his rank as quartermaster sergeant or merely as an ordinary sergeant.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. The orderly room sergeant in question would draw the pay of an orderly room clerk of six years service holding the rank of quartermaster sergeant.

MARINE PENSIONERS — CASE OF ROBERTS.

SIR JOHN BAKER (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to an inquest held at Portsmouth on the 1st instant on a Marine pensioner named Roberts, who for nearly four years was an inmate of Haslar Hospital, and who was required by the Admiralty to leave, and was informed that he would receive a pension of 2s. per day; whether he is aware that Roberts was discharged without any money being given him by the authorities to support him till his pension next became payable, and that he gave his address in the discharge book as

Alverstoke Workhouse, and was ultimately found in the water near Southsea Castle under circumstances pointing to suicide; and whether he is aware also that six other pensioners suffering from various chronic diseases were similarly discharged about the same time in a destitute condition, one of whom was found several times sleeping at nights in the furze near there, and if he will state who is responsible for the men being so discharged, and what steps it is proposed to take to avoid a recurrence of such cases.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The attention of the Admiralty was directed to this lamentable case immediately after the inquest by a letter from the Coroner, and reports were at once called for as to the facts of the case. I am not satisfied with the information I have received, and I would ask the hon. Member to postpone his question till I have made further inquiries.

THE SHIPBUILDING VOTE.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can now state when he expects to be able to take the Shipbuilding Vote.

MR. GOSCHEN: I cannot state till Friday.

DEPTFORD VICTUALLING YARD—OVERTIME RECORDS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it has been brought to his notice that dissatisfaction prevails in the Deptford Victualling Yard with reference to the manner in which the men's working time is recorded, and which has resulted in some men who worked overtime during the late pressure of work not receiving a gratuity, and to others who worked overtime from October, 1899, to 31st January, 1900, night and day on the victualling of the transports receiving gratuities ranging as low as from 3d. to 4s. or 5s. only, and this in the face of the promise made by him that from 25 to 50 per cent. bonus on the overtime worked would be paid; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the system now in vogue at Deptford for recording the men's working time which has led to the above result, with a view to the introduction of a more accurate system.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.): No representation has been received on the subject. The bonus paid was 50 per cent. on the actual amount of overtime earned by each individual in connection with the provisioning, etc., of the transports for South Africa, and as in five cases the amount of overtime work was only one hour, the gratuity amounted to 3d., being 50 per cent. of their pay for that hour. There is no reason to suppose that the system of recording overtime at Deptford is inaccurate, and no necessity appears for the inquiry suggested.

CAPTAIN NORTON: If I furnish the hon. Gentleman with numerous cases of inaccuracy, will he have them inquired into?

MR. MACARTNEY: I have carefully examined the list of payments, and there does not seem to be any inaccuracy. Still, if the hon. Gentleman will furnish me with names, I will further inquire.

TRAINING OF SEAMEN—TRAINING SQUADRON SAILING SHIPS.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty why the four sailing ships of the Training Squadron which had been refitted and prepared for sea in October last were suddenly dismantled when on the point of sailing; what has been done with these four ships; what is proposed to be done with them; and does the Admiralty propose to abolish the system of training men and officers in a squadron of seagoing sailing ships; if so, will he, before carrying out any such intention, take measures to ascertain the opinion of all the post captains in the Navy as to the probable effect of withdrawing from the Navy the training hitherto afforded by the Training Squadron.

MR. GOSCHEN: The reason for the change in question was that the number of cruisers required in consequence of the despatch of innumerable transports over a distance of 7,000 miles, and the necessity for watching the South African ports, rendered it expedient to substitute four fighting cruisers for four sailing ships. They have been put into the A Reserve. Their ultimate destination cannot yet be stated. I have already informed the hon. Member that no final or formal decision has been arrived at, but it is not proposed, as the hon. Gentleman, suggests, to circularize the 190 post captains on the active list.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman take any steps to ascertain the opinion of the post captains before a final decision is come to?

MR. GOSCHEN: I am acquainted with the views of many naval officers on the subject, and I find there is a profound division of opinion amongst them on this very important subject. My hon. friend may rest assured that no final decision will be taken without the greatest consideration.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA — PORTS OF CALL FOR MAIL STEAMERS.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the question of substituting Fremantle for Albany as the Western Australian port of call for mail steamers has made any progress of late.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am still in communication with the Australian Colonies in regard to this matter, and am not yet in a position to make any statement on the subject.

NEW ZEALAND—PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF BOUNDARIES.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received proposals from the Premier of New Zealand for the enlargement of the boundaries of that Colony, with a view to the incorporation of neighbouring groups of islands; and, if so, whether he has any objection to specifying the suggested acquisitions.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have received from the Governor of New Zealand a memorandum by his Prime Minister, in which he suggests that certain groups of islands might be incorporated in the Colony. The islands specified are the Cook group and the Fiji and Friendly Islands.

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH BILL —INTERFERENCE OF COLONIAL GOVERNORS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to the action of the Governor of New South Wales in taking part in the controversy arising out of the amendment of the Commonwealth Bill, and whether it is constitutional or in accordance with precedent that the representative of the Queen should take sides in discussions where differences of opinion arise among the people and in the Parliament of the colony of which he is Governor.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have seen the press telegram to which no doubt the hon. Member refers, but I am unable to say whether it accurately represents what the Governor said.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman be kind enough to answer that portion of the question which contains the inquiry whether the intervention of a Governor is constitutional and with precedent?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It is rather a wide question. I should say the answer depends a good deal upon the nature of the intervention and the exact language used by the Governor. No doubt it is unconstitutional for a Governor to take part in what may be called a party controversy, but I am happy to say that the question of the Commonwealth Bill has not been a party controversy in any part of Australia. But, after all, these questions are purely hypothetical, because up to the present time I have no information as to the Governor having used any language at all which bears on the subject.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire whether the statement in question is true?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then I will inquire myself.

SUPERINTENDENTS OF AFRICAN PROTECTORATES.

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether an office of Superintendent of African Protectorates has recently been created at the Foreign Office, what are the emoluments and duties attached to the office, and what are the Protectorates referred to.

*Mr. BRODRICK: Yes. The appointment alluded to has been made. The emoluments are similar to those assigned to the Third Assistant Under Secretary of State £1,000, rising at the end of five years to £1,200. The duties attached to the post are the general superintendence, under the immediate direction of the Secretary of State, of the correspondence relating to the administration and finance of the Protectorates administered by the Foreign Office, namely, Somaliland, East Africa, Uganda, and British Central Africa, as well as Zanzibar, so far as the administration of the latter is under the control of the Imperial Government.

INDIA—HONNIBAL SHOOTING CASE.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the Honnibal shooting case, when Captain Wood, accompanied by other officers, fired into a sugar cane plantation and hit an old man; whether he is aware that a villager named Kenguri detained the officers and was afterwards sentenced to four months' imprisonment on a charge of assault; whether inquiries have been made as to the injuries sustained by the old man at the hands of the officers, and whether he will lay a statement of the whole case upon the Table of the House.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The matter to which the hon. Member's question refers is now being inquired into by the Government of India, but I shall not receive any report on the subject for some days.

INDIAN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, with regard to the regiments and detachments of the Indian Native Army now serving beyond the frontier and abroad on the continent of Africa, Mauritius, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, and with reference to the troops now ordered to China, it is intended to enlarge the regular Indian Military Establishment to the extent to which it has been reduced, by extra recruitments or by the formation of new regiments; if so, whether he will state the estimated cost of such additions to the Indian Army charges.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The question of enlarging establishments to replace Indian troops who may be employed as permanent colonial garrisons is under consideration, but no such intention exists with regard to the native troops temporarily employed out of India. Any extra expense entailed by the consequent additions will be borne by Imperial revenues.

INDIAN FAMINE.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: Has the noble Lord the Secretary for India any information with regard to affairs in India?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I received a telegram in the middle of the day from the Government of India stating that the monsoon had broken, and that the rain was spreading satisfactorily over North Bombay, Behar, and the Central Provinces.

MAIDSTONE GAOL—WARDER SEARLE'S PENSION.

Mr. CORNWALLIS (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will take into his favourable consideration the increase of the pension of A. Searle, a retired warder, taken over from the county service in her Majesty's prison at Maidstone, from £43 1s., its present amount, to £61 10s. 8d., the amount equivalent to two-thirds of his pay and emoluments on retirement, a rate of pension which was formerly enjoyed by county prison officers in the county of Kent, as in most other counties, after twenty years' service, and which was guaranteed to them by the Act of 1877; and whether he will introduce legislation if necessary, at an early date to ensure to all old county prison officers the rate of pension which was in force when they joined the prison service.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. White Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool): The rate of pensions is fixed by the Treasury and not by the Home Office. The practice which has obtained in late years by which the pensions of ex-local prison officials have been supplemented by the local authorities has been disturbed by the decision of an auditor of the Local Government Board, and until I have received an answer from that Department on this point, I cannot decide what course should be pursued.

JUTE FACTORY REGULATIONS.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the prosecution, on 18th June, of Messrs. Ritchie, a firm of jute manufacturers at Stratford, for neglecting to provide a fan, as directed by the inspector, to prevent the inhalation of impure dust, and to the remarks of the magistrate on the necessity of proving in each case injury to health; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: The case to which the right hon. Baronet refers has engaged the special attention of the Home Office. The magistrate, in giving his decision, agreed to state a case on the question of law, and I at once gave instructions for the necessary steps to be taken to carry the matter to the High Court.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—BAILEY v. PLANT.

MR. M'KENNA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a decision given by Judge Yate Lee on the 19th June at the Crewe County Court, in a case in which Samuel Bailey sought to obtain the committal of his former employer, John Dudson Plant, mineral water manufacturer, upon a judgment summons issued against Plant to enforce payment of an award previously made in favour of Bailey under the Workmen's Compensation Act; and whether, seeing that the decision given by Judge Yate Lee was to the effect that the award having been made by an arbitrator was not an order or judgment of any competent Court which would constitute a proper ground for committal under the Debtors Act, he will consider the need of taking immediate steps to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act in this particular.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I agree that the point involved in the decision referred to is one of much practical importance, and will demand careful consideration when the question of amending the Workmen's Compensation Act comes to be dealt with. But I may perhaps point out that the law on the subject is open to question, seeing that another County Court Judge has, as I understand, taken a different view of it. I would add that in any case the workman is not, I think, without remedy. He could, as I am advised, obtain a judgment in the County Court for the payment of any arrears due to him, and the provisions of the Debtors Act would apply.

WALSINGHAM PETTY SESSIONS—CASE OF WILLIAM SPINKS.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case tried at the petty sessions held at Walsingham, in Norfolk, on 7th May last, when Mr. William Spinks, the defendant, was fined £5 and costs, the magistrates refusing to send the case for trial; and whether he will consider the expediency of an inquiry into the case.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I have been making inquiries, which are not yet completed, into this case.

CHARITY COMMISSION—SALES OF CHARITY PROPERTY.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Thirsk, as representing the Charity Commissioners, if he can state how the £882,914 obtained during the year 1899 by the sale of the real property of charities was made up, giving the number of acres of land sold, and the amount realised by the sale of house property and licensed houses, and agricultural land separately.

THE PARLIAMENTARY CHARITY COMMISSIONER (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I regret to find that I cannot give my hon. friend as full information as I had hoped without entailing very great labour on a hard-worked Department. Last year the Commission made 396 orders authorising sales of real property belonging to charities. To classify that property would require an examination of all the files relating to each of those 396 orders. Sixteen orders alone account for £518,510 out of the sum referred to in the question. These have been examined and show that of the money received under them £79,704 was for agricultural land, £438,806 for property in towns, including £202,000 for the site of the Roman Catholic church in Moorfields, £78,000 for the site of the Royal Ophthalmic Hospital, and £31,000 for property in St. Giles's, Cripplegate. I understand that the large sales of licensed premises, of which I had a vague but satisfactory recollection, took place in years previous to 1899. The great value of a church, not of a public-house, accounted largely for the rise in the figures of 1899 as compared with 1898.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: Is there no catalogue kept of these transactions?

MR. GRANT LAWSON: There are such records kept, of course, but the documents are very voluminous, and to get the exact details asked for they would all have to be carefully examined.

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD—SCHOOL PLACES.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education what is the number of school places recognised by the Board of Education in elementary schools, whether board or voluntary, in the area under the London School Board, what is the number of projected places in such schools, what is the number of children for whom it is at the present time necessary to provide places, whether the number of such children is diminishing yearly within the London area, and how many unused sites for schools are now held by the London School Board.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): (i.) There are 798,554 places recognised; (ii.) there are 28,214 places projected; (iii.) the number for whom it is necessary to provide places is 784,590; (iv.) the number of children is not diminishing; (v.) there are sixteen sites unused at present.

BARLINNIE PRISON—PAYMENT OF FINES BY PRISONERS.

SIR CHARLES CAMERON (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state what was the amount of money paid by prisoners committed to Barlinnie Prison in default of payment of fines in May, 1899, and May, 1900, respectively; in the latter month how much of the money paid consisted of fines paid in full on entering prison, and how much of fines paid under the Fines and Imprisonment (Scotland and Ireland) Act of last session; and in respect of such partial payments would he state the total number of prisoners making payment under the provisions of the Act, and the number of days by which the total terms of imprisonment were thereby curtailed.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): It is not convenient to give all the details asked for by the hon. Member in reply to a question in this House, but the Secretary for Scotland will be glad to furnish him with a statement containing the information he desires.

GREAT NORTHERN OF IRELAND RAILWAY FARES.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that dissatisfaction exists in Omagh owing to existing railway charges; is he aware that on Tuesday in each week the Great Northern Railway Company issues a market ticket to Belfast, and that the fare from Omagh is the same as from Derry, though Omagh is thirty-four miles nearer Belfast, and that the cost of carrying timber from Derry to Omagh is 6s. 3d. per ton, while the cost to Ballyshannon, though double the distance, is no more; is he also aware that the charge for conveying ten barrels of petroleum from Belfast to Omagh is as much as the charge for conveying fifteen barrels of petroleum from New York to Belfast; and will he state if he has any power to restrain the Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland in the matter of preferential rates.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The Board of Trade are not aware that the circumstances are as stated by the hon. Member, and in cases where preferential rates are shown to exist the jurisdiction to order their abatement is in the Railway and Canal Commissioners, and not the Board of Trade. It has, however, given me pleasure to draw the attention of the railway company to the subject-matter of the hon. Member's question.

STRANGFORD LOUGH—CARLINGFORD LIGHTHOUSE.

MR. BLAKISTON-HOUSTON (Down, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has received from the Irish Office any, and if so what, list of casualties and wrecks at the mouth of Strangford Lough; will he state from what source and at whose expense Carlingford Lighthouse is maintained, and for what class of shipping; and would he consider favourably the lighting of the existing lighthouse on Rock Angus by gas from the shore, and without the expense of lighthouse keepers in residence.

MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir, I have not received from the Irish Office any list of casualties and wrecks at the mouth of Strangford Lough. The four lighthouses at the entrance of Carlingford Lough are maintained by the Commissioners of Irish Lights at the expense of the general lighthouse fund, for the benefit of mail steamers and other vessels using that lough. Any proposal for the lighting of Strangford Lough which may be made by the Commissioners, as the general lighthouse authority, will receive my careful consideration.

MR. BLAKISTON-HOUSTON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received any further information on the subject of wrecks at the mouth of Strangford Lough.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): This is not a matter which comes under the official cognisance of the Irish Government, and consequently I have no information to give on the subject.

KILLARNEY LAND APPEALS.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of cases awaiting trial before the Land Commission for hearing appeals at Killarney; whether he is aware that fixtures have been provisionally made by the Appeal Commission in various parts of Ireland which do not include Killarney; and whether he can state about what date the Appeal Land Commission will sit at Killarney.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: There are 157 cases from the County Kerry in which appeals have not yet been heard. In the majority of these cases the appeals were only lodged since the 1st January last. The fact is as stated in the second paragraph. It is not at present possible to state the date on which the Commissioners will next sit at Killarney to hear appeals.

SALES TO IRISH TENANTS.

MR. MORRIS (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state how many sales to tenants under the 40th section of the late Land Act have taken place; and whether the Government will take steps to facilitate such sales.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Advances amounting to £269,334 were made by the Land Commission down to the end of March last, enabling 945 tenants upon sixty-two estates to purchase their holdings under the provisions of the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896. Proceedings for sale under the same enactment were pending, at the date mentioned, on some thirty-two other estates.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What will be the business on Thursday and Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The first Order on Thursday will be the Second Reading of the Tithes Bill, and on Friday Scotch Estimates will be taken.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—Mr. Howell (added in respect of the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill); and had appointed in substitution: Sir Powlett Milbank.

Mr. HALSEY further reported from the Committee, That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Veterinary Surgeons Amendment Bill:—Mr. Banbury, Sir Thomas Gibson-Carmichael, Mr. Colston, Earl of Dalkeith, Mr. Vaughan-Davies, Mr. Charles Douglas, Sir Frederick Fitz Wygram, Sir Michael Foster, Sir John Kinloch, Mr. M'Crae, Sir George Pilkington, Mr. Shaw-Stewart, Mr. Tennant, Sir John Tuke, and Colonel Welby.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (JOINT COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons on Municipal Trading:—Sir John Leng; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. John Wilson (Govan).

Report to lie upon the Table.

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTIONS FROM RATES).

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to give leave to the Marquess of Bristol to attend to be examined as a Witness before the Select Committee on Hospitals (Exemption from Rates).—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

NEW BILL.

URBAN DISTRICT COUNCILS.

Bill to amend the Law of Public Health, Local Government, and Rating with respect to Urban District Councils and otherwise, ordered to be brought in by Sir John William Maclure and Mr. Joseph Howard.

URBAN DISTRICT COUNCILS BILL.

"To amend the Law of Public Health, Local Government, and Rating with respect to Urban District Councils and otherwise," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 269.]

COMPANIES BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): Every one will admit that the question raised by this measure is of very great importance, having regard to the enormous amount of capital invested in limited liability companies, and having regard also to the great advantage which has unquestionably been derived by trade and commerce through the formation of these companies. No one will dispute that the operation of the Companies Acts has been largely beneficial to the trade and commerce of the country, but, at the same time, it will be generally acknowledged that there are many evils arising out of the existing law. A Select Committee appointed to inquire into the subject reported that the frauds committed and the losses sustained in connection with limited liability companies rendered necessary further regulation with respect to the formation of these companies; and a Return which was moved for by the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool showed that in one year, 1896, no fewer than 1,261 companies went into liquidation, involving the loss of no less than fifteen millions sterling, of which £8,284,000 were losses in capital. But, although these figures are considerable, they yet are, comparatively speaking, small compared to the enormous capital invested in public companies, which amounts at the present time to 1,500 millions sterling. Therefore, the losses in the year 1896 were only about 1 per cent. of the capital invested, and that fact should induce the House to approach the amending of the law relating to public companies with very great caution and circumspection. I think that in considering the question we should endeavour as far as possible to secure that there should be no unnecessary interference with the freedom of companies in carrying on their business and in the general management of their affairs, and that we should be extremely careful not to make the law so onerous and so oppressive as to prevent the very best class of our business men engaging in the operations of these companies. Great, undoubtedly, as are some of the evils existing under the present law, I can conceive no greater evil in connection with this matter than legislation which would prevent our best business men undertaking a share in the management of these companies, and which would have the effect of throwing the management into the hands of what I may call professional directors. Another matter we ought to bear in mind is that no legislation which we can undertake is at all likely to prevent mistakes in the management of companies which entails in many cases large losses. We cannot hope to prevent imprudence or incompetence of managers. Neither can we attempt to prevent errors of judgment. Another thing I think it will be impossible for us to do by any legislation we can pass is to protect investors from their own folly and carelessness. I think we are bound to endeavour so to amend the law as to insure the fullest information being given to all those who desire to take part in companies or invest their capital, but to attempt to prevent them being foolish in the investment of their capital is to attempt something it would be impossible to accomplish. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the law ought, as far as possible, to provide safeguards to protect the public against misleading or fraudulent devices or the fraudulent use of existing legal machinery. In order that this matter should be fully and carefully inquired into, the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen, when he was at the Board of Trade in 1894, appointed a strong Departmental Committee to consider this question. There was in the chair one of the ablest lawyers, who understood, perhaps, as much about commercial matters as any living lawyer, Lord Davey, two of Her Majesty's judges, and two or three representatives of the professional and mercantile classes. The Committee framed a Bill, and that Bill was introduced in 1896 in the House of Lords, and no one can dispute that the Bill received careful and, indeed, prolonged investigation elsewhere. But it was a matter which required careful investigation, and having regard to the other engagements of the distinguished legal authorities who were on that Committee it is not surprising the investigation of the Committee was spread over a considerable portion of time. The investigation in the House of Lords occupied the sessions of 1896, 1897, 1898, and 1899, and the result of the consideration of the Committee was an amending Bill which is practically the Bill which is now before the House. It is a Bill in many respects very different from the Bill originally proposed. It was considered that the Bill as originally proposed by the Committee which was appointed in 1894 was in many respects much too drastic in its character, and it was considerably modified. I do not mean to say I should not be glad to see a little less modification in the Bill, but it was very carefully considered by a body of very eminent gentlemen, and I am not disposed to quarrel with the decision they arrived at. The Bill as introduced is practically the Bill which was framed by the Select Committee of the House of Commons. In fact, it is identical with that Bill with one single exception, to which I will presently refer. I shall not trouble the House with all the details of the measure, but I shall endeavour briefly to point out some of the salient points of the Bill now before the House. The Bill provides, among other things, against the evil of directors acting without qualification or taking gifts of paid-up shares. Many scandalous cases have arisen in connection with matters of this kind. It is quite clear that if directors undertake the responsibility of managing these businesses they ought to be properly qualified, and their qualification ought to be secured in the ordinary way, and certainly ought not to be bestowed upon them by the promoters of the company or by anyone interested in the flotation. Another evil against which the Bill provides is bogus or fictitious subscriptions. It is very often the case that a company proceeds to allotment when only a most insignificant portion of the capital has been *bona fide* subscribed with the inevitable consequence that in the course of time—sometimes a longer, sometimes a shorter period—the company goes into liquidation. We think the public in subscribing ought to be distinctly informed what is the minimum subscription on which the directors will go to allotment. We therefore provide that the minimum subscription shall be stated in the prospectus, and that three-fourths of the total amount due on application and allotment shall be paid up before the company commences business, and paid up *bona fide* by those who have subscribed. We thus secure that the company starts with an adequate capital, or, at least, that those who subscribe know the capital with which it starts business. We further propose to provide in the Bill that a Return of the allotment shall be made to the Registrar within seven days, so that all those who are interested may have an opportunity of seeing who their co-partners are. There is another scandal which has presented itself to the eyes of the public on many occasions in connection with companies

—namely, secret payments to vendors and promoters. That, I think, is one of the greatest evils in connection with the existing law with which we have to deal. To prevent evils of that nature we provide that a statement shall be necessary in the prospectus of the amounts payable to the vendor or promoter, and the consideration therefor. We do not consider it desirable in every case to prevent—in fact, we cannot prevent—payments being made, but we think that those who subscribe ought to have fully set out in the prospectus the amount which has been paid to both the vendors and the promoters, and what the money has been paid for. There is a practice prevalent of what is called underwriting shares. That is a practice which is not objectionable in itself so long as the public who are asked to take shares in the company know what is to be paid for underwriting, and the amount of the shares which have been underwritten. We consider this matter to be one of such importance that precautions have been taken in the Bill to prevent this provision being set aside by any waiver or agreement. Another evil which at present exists is that when it comes to the winding up of some companies it is found that the whole of the available assets of the company are mortgaged, and there is nothing at all to divide amongst the unhappy creditors. The only remedy which can be applied to this particular evil is to take care that publicity is given to any mortgages which exist. It is therefore provided that any mortgages shall be registered with the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies and be open to public inspection, and that any mortgages not so registered shall be invalid. There are several other provisions of considerable importance and great value with which I will not trouble the House, but with which no doubt the House is familiar. There are some provisions in this Bill which were not in the original Bill, some of which have given rise to considerable discussion and much opposition. There are the clauses dealing with the sale of drugs and the carrying on of a medical practice by a company. I am bound to say that I do not think those provisions are really very germane to the present Bill. I have no doubt that in themselves the provisions, or something analogous to them, with regard to these matters would be a beneficial alteration of the law, but I cannot say that I think they are in their proper place in a Bill for amending the Companies Acts. If those matters are to be dealt with it would be much better that they should be dealt with by a separate Bill, rather than in the measure now before the House. However, it will be for the Committee when they come to consider these provisions to decide whether they should be proceeded with, or whether they should be struck out and relegated to some other Bill at some other time. There is another provision which was not in the original Bill, and which, I think, is open to very serious objection. I mean the clause which gives a preference to a certain class of creditors incurred within three months prior to the winding-up of the company. That is an entirely new departure. I have no doubt the noble Lord who proposed this clause in the House of Lords had very good grounds, or thought he had, for inserting such a provision in the Bill; but having regard to the very serious alteration of the law which is made by that provision, I am quite unable to ask the House to retain the clause. It will be a very serious infringement of the rights of debenture holders, and I should imagine the House will not care to entertain it. There is one provision which we have omitted from the Bill as it originally stood to which I should like to refer, as it is the object of an Amendment to the Second Reading standing in the name of an hon. Member opposite. Even though the hon. Gentleman objects to the omission, he would hardly be justified in moving the rejection of the Bill. What is the history of the omission of that clause? The clause to which I refer is that repealing the twenty-fifth clause of the Companies Act, which sets out that all shares which are not paid for in cash, and for which other consideration is given, should be registered, the result of non-registration being that the holder of the shares is liable to pay up in cash, although he has already paid for them in some other form. This was justifiably held to be a rather serious provision. But an Act was passed two or three years ago by my right hon. friend, who was then Sir John Lubbock, which provided that in the case where registration had not taken place an innocent holder could appeal to the Court, which could relieve him of the difficulties in which he was placed by the non-registration, and order registration to take place. That, in the opinion of my right hon. friend, who was then chairman of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, amply met the circumstances of the case. The hon. Gentleman opposite is not content with that, but desires to repeal Clause 25 altogether, and to do away with all registration of shares which are paid for otherwise than by cash. I do not think that would be a right thing to do. In the first place, I think it is perfectly right that persons should be able to make themselves acquainted with the fact whether the shares were paid for in cash or by some other consideration, and I hope the House will support me in resisting such an Amendment as that to be proposed by the hon. Gentleman opposite. As I have said, there are some things omitted from this Bill which I myself and many other persons would like to have seen included, but the Bill does not profess to deal with all abuses. I believe this measure to be an honest attempt to find a remedy, and a sufficient remedy, for some of the most flagrant imperfections in the present law, and as such I beg to commend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

*MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): The right hon. Gentleman has alluded to the Amendment which stands in my name, and he has rightly divined my intention, for I do not propose to move that Amendment. The hon. Gentleman will no doubt remember that the Committee referred to this clause in very strong terms indeed, and recommended that nothing short of its repeal would be satisfactory. I think the right hon. Gentleman himself is under a slight misapprehension as to Lord Avebury's Act, because I observe that in introducing this Bill he referred to this Act as having been passed subsequent to this Bill coming from the House of Lords; but that is not so. Notwithstanding this Act, in the opinion of the House of Lords the repeal of this clause was considered necessary. The right hon. Gentleman said that we wished to get rid of the registration of shares which were not fully paid up, but that is not our intention at all. It is perfectly right and proper that such shares should be registered, and if the right hon. Gentleman wishes to increase the penalty against directors who do not register them, for my part I should be very pleased. But what we do find fault with is that, owing to the working of this clause, innocent parties are punished and not the guilty. I may buy shares in a company at the full price or at a premium, and if this company goes into liquidation I may find myself mulcted in a sum far greater than the value of those shares, and that seems to me to be a very hard case. The method of procedure provided by Lord Avebury's Act is complicated and expensive, and will probably involve the consulting of a lawyer. That is very hard indeed upon innocent people who may be in no way to blame for having got into trouble. I hope that some Amendment will be submitted which in no way interferes with the registration of shares.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): The right hon. Gentleman, in introducing this Bill, has traced its history and commended it to the House in such moderate and conciliatory language that I have no wish to import political controversy into the discussion. There is an admission on both sides of the House that some reform of the law is needed. For that reason we may dispose of any apprehension that political controversy will arise over this measure, and we may address ourselves to the consideration of the question as to how far the Bill is likely to remove the evils, the existence of which we all admit. We need not go back further than the Committee of 1894. That Committee prepared a Bill, and it will be found in the appendix to the Report, which contains a survey of the whole subject. Since then the matter has remained in the House of Lords. This Bill was thrown on the House of Lords and tossed to and fro in that assembly, and in that process it has suffered a good deal. The right hon. Gentleman himself evidently regrets that the Bill does not contain more of the drastic force which it had when it emerged from the exceptionally strong Committee which originally prepared it. It was exposed in the Lords to two dangers. There were a large number of people who had the ear of the House of Lords who were very apprehensive that difficulties would be thrown in the way of directors and promoters of companies; and there was also that highly critical spirit which is fully developed in lawyers, which is very much in its place and extremely valuable in the House of Lords when sitting as a judicial tribunal, but which diminishes its reforming force when it comes to deal with practical evils. Anyone who reads the very interesting Reports of the House of Lords Committee will perceive how that legal critical spirit was brought to bear in this matter, and how anxious they were to remove everything which might lead to any difficulty or difference. It seems to me that that ought to have been qualified to a greater extent than it was by a sense of the dangers and evils which the existing law causes, and a disposition to try experiments a little more boldly in order to remove those evils. The public all the time are suffering, and, as was said by the right hon. Gentleman, we cannot undertake to prevent companies making mistakes or give complete protection to investors; but still we must endeavour to remove, as far as we can, those devices by which investors are deceived, and we must remember that there will always be a large number of persons who are proper objects for the sympathy of this House and for legislation, because what they are endeavouring to do is in itself perfectly legitimate, and they are in many cases devoid of legal advice and the means of getting it. If everybody who was going to invest consulted a trustworthy and skilful solicitor or stockbroker there would be very little difficulty in the matter, but a great many people have not got those aids, and they are liable to be deceived in a way which would not deceive those of us who have some experience. I do not say that you can prevent those people being deceived, but you ought to remove out of their path the easiest means by which they can be deceived. In one respect I am not quite sure that this evil is not greater at the present time than it was some years ago, because the fall in the rate of interest has imposed such a severe hardship upon many people deriving fixed incomes from small sums of money invested, that when those investments are paid off they are more than ever anxious to embark in rash ventures when a comparatively high rate of interest is promised, and the evil is rather greater than it was before. I think that is a reason for endeavouring to deal somewhat boldly with this matter, although I do not for a single moment deny that, as a general proposition, it is impossible for us to avoid a great many of the losses which will happen. Of course, I am only speaking of people with small incomes, who are the legitimate objects of our protection. *A propos* of that, I should like to say that the Bill as it is drawn seems to me to represent the minimum of what ought to be put forward for legislation. If hon. Members will look at the Report of the Committee they will see that it scrutinises very carefully all the objections that might be made to more drastic remedies, and they will see also that it was a Committee of a very conservative nature. That Committee consisted of three experienced and able Judges, several solicitors experienced in all matters relating to common law, and several mercantile men who were eminently representative of the mercantile community. From what I have heard stated by some hon. Members of the House, nearly every plan that has ever been suggested in the public press or in the House for improving the law was brought before that Committee, and those proposals were subjected to the most rigorous examination. Many of them were rejected, and nothing was allowed to pass which had not run the gauntlet of that Committee, and the Report was a unanimous one. Therefore, I attach a great deal of importance to the fact that a Committee, composed as this was, arrived at the decision that this Bill was necessary. It has been said with truth that a very large part of the capital of this country is embarked in these limited liability enterprises. I think it was said somewhere lately that the total British capital which is embarked in limited liability companies is more than double the capital in such companies in France or Germany, and is greater than the amount embarked in both those countries taken together. That shows how large a proportion of British capital is invested in these concerns, and how very careful we ought to be in dealing with them. But these prosperous companies in which this capital is invested are not the companies which will be affected by this Bill. Those are substantial concerns, whose prosperity proves that this Bill will not affect them. It is also said that we must not be hard on honest men, and make it difficult for them to take up business as directors of companies. We must also remember that honest men have always had the most complete protection in the courts of law. I am aware of exceedingly few cases—and I doubt if anyone in this debate will be able to quote more than an extremely small number of cases—in which any director or promoter of a company who has honestly endeavoured to do his duty as an honest man has ever suffered at the hands of the courts. I believe such cases are extremely few. There are cases in which a man who is personally honest, who goes into a company knowing very little of law or business, and who practically sells his name—which is very likely a respectable and distinguished one—to the company because it will adorn the prospectus and give confidence to investors—these persons sometimes suffer for the acts of others who have more knowledge and fewer scruples. They embark in transactions which often come before the courts, and for which the directors are severely handled and are frequently obliged to pay for their improper proceedings. A man personally honest may suffer in that case, but he is not entitled to much sympathy from us. Nothing does more harm in connection with companies than when a man, honest, but ignorant and incompetent, gives the sanction of his name to acts which are afterwards condemned by the courts. Therefore I do not include such a person in the category of honest men whom we must protect. Men who really know their business and who desire to give diligence and attention to it have nothing to fear from any legislation likely to be passed by this House, because they will be perfectly certain to have the protection of the courts. I believe, therefore, that the main thing we have to do is to strengthen the hands of the courts, and to extend their powers by stopping up certain loopholes which some decisions of the courts have made, and which some provisons in previous Acts required the courts to give. The Courts of Equity have in the main framed our company laws, and taking them all in all they have done it with great skill and judgment. They have been supported as a rule by the opinion of the commercial community, and they have done a great deal to keep that opinion at a good level; and were it not for the action of the Courts of Equity we should be in a much worse position than we are at present. But these Courts are embarrassed in two ways: in some cases by provisions of the Statute law which do not enable them to go as far as they would like in checking fraud, and in other cases by certain decisions which have been given and which it is impossible for the Courts to get over. I do not say that these decisions were necessarily wrong at the time they were given, because it could not then be seen what use would be made of them, but use has been made of them, and they have given fraudulent persons loopholes of escape. I believe the right course for legislation to take in these matters is not so much to frame a great number of small provisions, as to strengthen the law in its general principles and to encourage the Courts to deal with fraud in every form in which they find it. You cannot exhaust the particulars of fraud. Fraud is infinite, and the ingenuity of man will find new methods of evading any Act we may draw. It is therefore quite impossible to stop up all the loopholes. What we ought to do is to entrust the Courts with such wide powers and to define fraud so clearly and broadly, that wherever it may appear it may be dealt with. I should therefore be the last person to suggest that we should attempt to revise the law by going into details to meet all cases which have originated in the past. It is better to lay down principles and to trust to the Courts to carry them out. Of course we must also remember that any amendments we may make in the law must be tentative and experimental. We cannot reach finality in matters of this kind. The most we can do is to provide, as far as we can, against the provisions we make being evaded. New evasions will no doubt arise, and in the course of a few years it may be necessary to deal with this subject again, and still further extend the provisions of the law. I think, therefore, on the whole, that perhaps the best thing we can do now in the way of amending the Bill is to extend it a little further, and to restore some of those broad definitions and declarations of the duties and liabilities of promoters, directors, managers and auditors which were contained in the Bill as it came from the Committee in 1894, and which, to a considerable extent, have been left out. I will not trouble the House with a minute examination of the omissions, but I may tell hon. Members that several important sections contained in the Bill as it came from the Committee, with regard to the duties and liabilities of promoters, the duties and liabilities connected with the issue of a prospectus, the annual balance sheet, and the duties of auditors, have all been omitted from the present Bill, and in several cases the previous Bill contained provisions for imposing fines and declaring that such and such an act should be a misfeasance which are not in the Bill now proposed. It would be tedious to the House to go through the omissions in detail, but if any hon. Member will take the trouble to compare the present Bill with the Bill as it came from the Committee in 1894, he will see that there are several omissions which tend to weaken the present Bill as a whole. I think therefore it would be desirable in Committee to consider the desirability of restoring these provisions. With reference to criminal proceedings, the Committee of 1894 did not propose to deal with the criminal law; neither does the present Bill except in one clause. If I may venture to express an opinion, I think the Committee of 1894 was right, and that the Government are right now. To deal with these matters on a criminal basis ought really to be undertaken in a separate enactment. Even then I am not very sanguine about the effect of it, because where criminal proceedings have been tried Courts and juries have been extremely timorous in applying the criminal law, and frequently the attempt to apply the criminal law in connection with a company has failed just because juries were unwilling to convict. Therefore, I believe the Government are well-advised in not introducing such a provision into the present Bill. The provisions of the Bill which seem to me to deserve the support and confidence of the House are those with regard to the issue of prospectuses, the statutory meetings, the qualifications of directors, and the information to be given as to their position and their fees and commissions, if any, the provision that no business is to be entered upon on insufficient capital, and the provision as regards the registration of mortgages and charges. There is absolute unanimity with regard to the registration of mortgages and charges, and I think that part of the Bill will receive universal assent, and will do the greatest good. I need not return to the repeal of Section 25 of the Act of 1867, because it has been already dealt with, but I associate myself with what has been said on the matter by my hon. friend the Member for Kincardine. I hope when we get into Committee the repeal of that section, as recommended by the Committee of 1894, will be included in the Bill, because the object of the section is attained in another part of the Bill, and therefore the provisions have become superfluous, although, if retained, they will be annoying and dangerous to innocent persons. I think the Government was also well advised in omitting the clause giving preference to trade creditors in respect of debts incurred within three months of the winding up. That could not be supported. There are two other points to which I should like to call attention. The first has reference to Scotland. As the House knows, the winding up provisions of the Act of 1890 did not apply to Scotland, and as that is not regarded as satisfactory I wish to direct the attention of the House and the Lord Advocate to it. There is one other provision which seems to me to merit attention. The House will recollect that under the Act of 1890 power is given in certain cases to the Courts to order an examination, but this valuable power has been lost by a recent decision of the House of Lords which declared that an examination could only be ordered where the Official Receiver alleged fraud against a particular person. That is a very valuable power in some respects, and one of the best parts of our winding-up machinery, because it enables the whole history of a company to be examined into, and may afford valuable ground for subsequent proceedings. This decision of the House of Lords resulted in a very serious loss indeed, and we might take the present opportunity to extend the law by providing that where the Official Receiver reports that he has reason to believe that there has been fraud in the conduct of a company, but may not be able to take the responsibility of reporting fraud against a particular person, the Court should have power to order an examination. The House will notice that a part of the present Bill proposes to deal with the winding up, and therefore there is nothing unreasonable in introducing a provision of this kind. I hope the law officers or the right hon. Gentleman will consider this matter before the Committee stage, because I believe that it is an amendment which would considerably improve the present machinery for winding up companies. Then there is the question of consolidation. It has been represented in several quarters that the whole of the law relating to companies should be consolidated. I have the greatest sympathy with the general idea of consolidating the law on the subject, but I doubt whether the time for consolidation has yet arrived. Something, however, may depend on the shape in which this Bill finally passes. If it passes in a satisfactory form there may be occasion for consolidation, but if it passes as it now is I believe it will create a demand on the part of the community for a further strengthening of the law. It is quite clear you cannot proceed to consolidate the law until you have got it into a tolerably satisfactory state; therefore I doubt whether the time for consolidation has yet arrived. Although no doubt consolidation would make it easier to administer the law and would remove a great many evils, still there would be no good in trying to accomplish it until the law is in a shape which would be regarded with satisfaction. Although I must again express my opinion that this Bill is not quite strong enough, and that it would be better if it were in the form in which it came from the Committee, and that some of the provisions in the original Bill should be restored, still I do not for a moment suggest that we ought not to take it as an instalment of reform. I believe especially as regards the registration of mortgages and charges, the position of directors, and the provisions with regard to commissions, the Bill will be a substantial improvement on the present law, and in the hope that it will be improved and considerably strengthened in Committee I should be sorry that the chance should be lost of improving the law. I therefore venture to hope that there will be no disposition in any part of the House to oppose the Bill, and I wish the right hon. Gentleman all success in passing it.

MR. HOARE (Hampstead): The principle of the Bill is one which we all must accept. There are, however, several provisions in the measure which we ought to accept with a certain amount of caution. There are exceptions to every rule, and there are a great many points in the Bill which require careful consideration before being passed into law. My object in rising is merely to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he would be good enough to arrange that this Bill should be taken in Committee of the whole House. It is a very important Bill indeed, and it deals with gigantic interests. Hon. Members who are more especially interested in it are for the most part men who are engaged all through the day, and would find a Grand Committee inconvenient and undesirable. If my right hon. friend can see his way to have a Committee of the whole House on the Bill, I believe that course would meet with the approval of the House. The criticisms would practically be of a friendly character, and merely intended to improve the Bill. I believe in the long run that course would save time and conduce to the passing of the Bill.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): As a member of the Board of Trade Departmental Committee, to which the right hon. Gentleman opposite has referred, I should like to say a few words. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that he has not exaggerated the character of the discussions in the Committee, and for my own part I shall never forget the destructive and constructive abilities of two of its members. The need for reforming the law is shown by what has taken place at the last annual meeting of the Association of Chambers of Commerce. No less than six chambers of commerce proposed resolutions on this subject, and they were carried unanimously. In fact one does not speak too widely when one states that this legislation is the most important commercial measure proposed in this Parliament, and I hope it will be carried into law. The scandals in connection with companies are important in themselves, but they have even a very more important effect, namely, their destructive effect on trade and commerce. They have been the means of destroying the investment of capital, and creating distrust, which is most disadvantageous to commercial enterprises. Then we have also to regard the manner, which almost amounts to a public scandal, in which people, especially those who have scanty means of information and guidance, have been plundered by means of company arrangements of the very worst kind. The evidence before the Committee in this connection showed the most startling evils. We all admit that there is great difficulty in providing a remedy. I think the law ought to impose as many impediments as it possibly can against fraudulent acts, whether in connection with companies or otherwise, so as to prevent them to the utmost possible extent. I think this Bill is a move in the right direction. The necessity of caution has been referred to; and when we remember that some 1,500 millions are invested in these companies, the safeguarding of these enterprises is one reason for the exercise of great caution. If we take steps ruinous to these enterprises it may be impossible to retrieve them. It was shown conclusively in the Committee, by evidence from abroad, that the condition of the law in this country, and the facilities which it gave for investment, have been the means of attracting to this country many hundred millions of capital which otherwise would have been invested elsewhere. We ought not to destroy these facilities. Joint stock companies have many advantages. They are an outlet for capital, and they give strength to capital by association, but there is one point in which they have been an especial advantage to the whole body of the people, and that is they have given an opportunity for investment in trade to the non-commercial classes. There is, however, nothing more absurd than the misconception that because a man puts capital into a concern, but devotes no time and no thought to it, he should expect as large a return as a man who devotes not only capital but time and personal ability to his business. Joint stock companies have also another advantage, and that is the opportunity they afford to small investors to invest capital. They have also the further advantage of enabling an employer to give an interest in his business to his employees who have helped him to build it up. With regard to what has been said as to the care which should be exercised in dealing with company directors, I think it should be borne in mind that the principle which ought to be adopted in this kind of legislation is one of discrimination and not one of universal incrimination. I think we should remember that, whatever may be the evils in the administration of companies, the great majority of them are both honest and prosperous. The same may be said of directors. Whatever want of care may have been shown in some instances, or the recklessness or even the dishonesty of directors, the vast majority of them are both honest and laborious. I venture to go further, and say that even promoters in many instances may be perfectly honest and capable. The great point is not to deter the most capable men from taking part in company administration. I believe a thoroughly good business board to be the greatest security of the investor. Upon this point I should like to state what a great foreign jurist said on the question of imposing penalties for directors. He said that in the business world it was known that the imposition of penalties did not stop in any great degree persons who were determined to make their fortune by robbing their neighbours of their earnings, whereas it would keep out honourable men who were afraid of finding themselves committing an error without knowing it. That is the principle on which we should as far as possible act. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman opposite that there are some omissions in the Bill, as compared with the draft Bill as prepared by the Committee, which might perhaps be restored, especially the provisions relating to the financial obligations of a company, the obligation to keep certain specific accounts and to have a proper audit, and also some definition of what a proper audit ought to be. I think the Bill accomplishes much by requiring in the prospectus an exact record of the status of the company and its directors. Another point upon which the Bill is to be approved is that it strikes at the great evil of over-capitalisation. At present we have a long chain of vendors, and at the end of the chain the immediate vendor to the company, who fixes the price—that is after a large number of intermediate profits have been made. I am glad that those profits are to be disclosed, so that an investor may be able to use his own judgment. Another great improvement is the way in which the Bill strikes at improvident allotment. I have known many cases in which a vendor, by means of subsidised directors, has insisted on allotment when it was most improvident from a business point of view; and therefore the provision in this Bill dealing with that matter is a great improvement.

Sir Albert Rollit.

With regard to registration, I think the House will agree that it would be impossible to have double registration in this matter. One reference was made of a practical character to what may be termed bogus allotments, that is to say, allotments to nominees and vendors in order to secure completion of the contract by the company going to allotment. A very interesting specimen of what may be done in company making is shown in the case of a company registered in 1891, the capital of which was 9,600,000 shares of one farthing each; the total subscribed capital was 1¾d. Without saying that that is typical, there are a great many companies which have commenced on very similar terms. The great want of the present law is the want of the opportunity of combination between the shareholders in the earlier stages. They are scattered, and do not meet until the statutory meeting, and when they have been defrauded they are not able to take combined action. I think this Bill is an improvement in this respect, that in future the statutory meeting must be called within one month, and the accounts must be on the table. I would further suggest that they should be open for inspection for some days afterwards. I think there you have great security for the combined action of shareholders in any fraud which may take place. Some remarks have been made about debentures, but I do not think the House yet realises the importance of this point. A man owning a decaying business turns it into a company, and the company issues to him debentures, and he becomes his own secured creditor from that moment. Not only are his creditors out in the cold, but the shareholders also, because he practically holds all the assets. In future both mortgages and debentures will have to be registered at the office of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, and then anyone who thinks of becoming a shareholder or proposes to give credit will have the means of knowing exactly what the financial position of the company is with regard to the preliminary expenses. I think the company should undertake to pay them. Now, a general assertion has been made that underwriting is illegal and grossly immoral. I do not say it is not legal, because from time to time we have had expressions of opinion with regard to it, but there is nothing immoral in it. It is a necessary commercial element in the formation of a company, but a check would be placed against dissipation of capital by underwriting without information being given. There are some clauses which go some way to secure honest administration, and Clause 30 does not appear to me to be at all too drastic, providing as it does that a wilful misstatement should render a director liable to conviction of a misdemeanour. I must also refer to the absence of some official provision such as the Committee proposed, as to the question of audit, and some definition of the duties of auditors: I think the clauses which we inserted in Committee, after full consideration as to what the effect of their introduction might be, might have been retained, and I still hope that they will be inserted in the measure. Impress on every director his obligation to use reasonable care and prudence in the exercise of his powers, and give a right of action to the shareholders in the event of a director departing from that great commercial principle. I think it would be a wholesome check to directors if they knew that they would have to devote all their time to their duties, and that if they did not they were under some liability to the shareholders. In conclusion I have only to say I most respectfully differ from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade in what he said with reference to the consolidation of the Company Acts. Consolidation is almost a necessary preliminary to amendment, and in many instances the House has acted on that principle. The Bankruptcy Act is one instance, and the Merchant Shipping Act is another. In both those cases the Government complained of Amendments delaying consolidation. We have already [illegible]rty statutes dealing with company law, and I cannot help thinking that probably, among the difficulties which directors have to meet, not the least is that of not knowing what the law is, and not being able to find out exactly what is the position of the law in regard to this matter. In this country we urgently need consolidation. We are outstripped by other countries who have consolidated their laws, with great advantage to themselves. The need of this Bill has been demonstrated; it carries out a principle that the whole House will be ready to accept. It may not protect completely those who rush to be rich, but if they take more care in their own interests the Bill will give them full opportunity of knowing what they may expect, their rights and their obligations as shareholders and directors, and it will, I hope, be the means of improving commercial morality and advancing the trade of the country.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S): I trust the House will not yield to the suggestion that some method of consolidation should precede the passing of this amendment of the law. The right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill has pointed out that it is impossible to deal with so large a subject except by instalments; and that this measure is nothing more than an instalment in the settlement of a number of difficulties that must arise in the administration of so large a branch of the law. I do not propose to waste the time of the House in praising the merits of the Bill, but I wish for a brief space to point out some omissions which have been made from it. It may be that these omissions are inevitable—no law is ideal and perfect. It is possible that some of the scandals which of late years have shocked the commercial world are beyond the reach of the law. This measure, as I read it, would leave many of these scandals entirely uncorrected. Promotion, where it is undertaken on behalf of a company, will no doubt be exposed by the operation of one clause of the Bill. But modern company promotion is undertaken by the vendor, and the moneys expended by the vendor in promotion are expended out of the moneys received by him as the price of the property or business he sells. I doubt whether this Bill will ensure publicity being given either to the amount expended in that fashion or the mode in which the expenditure takes place. Let me give to the House a concrete case. A small business is bought for a few thousand pounds, which it is proposed by the promoter to sell to a company for £45,000. There is a margin of £30,000 of profit. The promoter of the company has purchased the business and paid for it, and therefore he is not struck at by the clause which attacks the vendor in this Bill. Having purchased the business and paid for it, it would be impossible for him to obtain from an individual purchaser anything like a corresponding profit to that which would be given by a company. How is that profit divided? Half of it is distributed in payments to directors who join the board and give to the company the advantage and use of their names. A portion is expended among the press, and a portion is used in paying for the placing of shares. That promotion account shows that £30,000 is divided as to one-half—or a large portion of one-half—in illegitimate expenditure, and the rest is net profit in the hands of the promoters. That is a scandal which was exposed in a very recent case. Now, I have scrutinised this Bill to ascertain whether any of its provisions would operate to prevent any repetition of such a disgraceful state of things. Of course, where the promotion is undertaken by some other person than the vendor, the Bill gives protection by publicity to the account, but where the promotion is done by the vendor, there is no means by this measure of ensuring that the shareholders and the world will know exactly what the profit is, and how it has been expended. I will try and suggest to the right hon. Gentleman in Committee some mode in which this matter can be reached, but I think he will agree with me that in its present state transactions of the nature to which I have referred will not be interfered with by the Bill. Another omission from the Bill is that it assumes that every company is formed by means of a prospectus or of some preliminary statement; and that adequate notice is given to the shareholders by providing that certain information shall appear either in that prospectus or preliminary or initial statement. That assumption is falsified in many cases in which we get a company formed without prospectus or preliminary circular. It is inadequate to deal with cases where the capital is subscribed, not on the faith of the prospectus or preliminary statement, but on the faith of the names in the prospectus, in which case the prospectus is not read. This Bill is inadequate to deal with such a case, and also to deal with other cases of that kind. For instance, it is also inadequate to deal with a case where, although there are statements in the prospectus, there are other statements in the prospectus or in the articles of association which compel every shareholder to waive the rights which he may by law be entitled to enforce against the person who is responsible for the misrepresentation on which he relied. It is perfectly well known to Members of of the House that many companies are originated in the neighbourhood of the

Stock Exchange without either prospectus or preliminary statement, particularly in gold speculation, and that a market is created by the operation of certain interested persons, and the mere fact that shares are being dealt in daily induces the public to come in and deal with these shares. In all companies of that class the provision of the Bill ensuring that certain information should be given in the prospectus ceases to have any operation. In regard to waiving, I recently saw a case in which it was stipulated in the articles of association that the directors of a company might make secret profits to any extent, and that the shareholders should not be entitled to enforce the law against these directors in respect of any profits that they had made. I wonder how many of the shareholders of that company ever read the articles of association which imposed that most serious restriction upon their legal rights. I suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he may reconsider some of the provisions of the Bill. First of all, so as to deal with the case of certain companies which come into existence without a prospectus, or if with a prospectus with statements qualifying the provisions in regard to the waiver of shareholders' rights, and also dealing with those cases in which reliance is placed less on the language of the prospectus than on the names of the directors, who often allow the use of their names to the company promoters. There are other topics on which I might dilate. The first is in reference to the one-man company to which the hon. Member for South Islington has referred. A very useful decision of the Court of Appeal was recently reversed by the House of Lords, with reference to the legal obligation attaching to the proprietor of a company of that kind; and I should suggest to the right hon. Gentleman the introduction of a clause reviving the right of the creditors to have recourse against the person who has, in point of fact, the whole of the company's property secured by debentures and receives the whole of the profits made by the business. Then there is one other *casus omissus*, and that is the failure to deal with the very serious condition of things which has arisen in connection with founders' shares. The ordinary shareholders and the public ought to know, in plain terms, on the face of the prospectus, what are the rights of the holders of this very novel and anomalous interest in connection with a company. One case recently made public showed that the holders of founders' shares controlled the directors and the whole company's business, with the result that all the profits made by the company over 6 per cent. went into the pockets of the holders of the founders' shares, though that profit was obtained at the risk of the ordinary shareholders of the company. In other words, the holders of the founders' shares were in a position to utilise the whole of the company's machinery for the purpose of filling their pockets with the profits, and to cast the whole liability for losses on the ordinary shareholders. Now, that position was only to be ascertained after a most careful inspection and scrutiny of the articles of association, which being ascertained would have barred any general subscription. And yet that company was floated under the authority of a well-known man. I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman to insert a provision in this Bill that, where there are founders' shares the full rights of the holders of these founders' shares in reference to the company's assets shall appear in the prospectus, so that a very important element of that kind might not be lost sight of by the public who are invited to subscribe their money. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade on having introduced this Bill, which, I cannot help thinking, is one of the most important commercial measures introduced in this Parliament. I trust it will be discussed in Committee of the whole House, and that in the end we shall have a very valuable and important addition to our commercial law.

MR. MARTIN (Worcestershire, Droitwich) said he hoped that the Committee stage of the Bill would be taken in the whole House. No doubt many of the provisions of the Bill were fairly satisfactory, but they could not all be accepted without reservation, and it was necessary that every clause should have the fullest consideration. For instance, the provision in regard to the qualification of directors might exclude men, such as foremen in works owned by a small company, who would make most valuable directors if a qualification were given to them. Then he would point out that a return in reference to members of a new company was to be made within seven days; but he was informed by a secretary to a company that that would be almost, if not quite, impossible, and that it would take six weeks or more before such a return could be made. The provisions as to dealing with vendors as promoters would require to be very carefully considered. It was perfectly true that the vendor was now generally the promoter, but it was perfectly impossible to descriminate between the two in the Bill as it was drawn. In regard to the question as to the publicity of mortgages, that was a step in the right direction; but even there the clause might work great hardship. It was the custom for a company which had large sums of money coming in at certain seasons of the year to borrow money from their bankers on the security of their uncalled capital for a period of six weeks or two months, until that money came in. The clause in the Bill might prevent them doing this, because the publicity given to the transaction might injure the position of the company. If that danger could be avoided the clause otherwise would be satisfactory. The House ought to remember that one of the objects of the Limited Liability Acts was to enable people to lose their money, if he might say so. What was wanted was to give facilities not for speculation, but for enterprises which were attended with a certain amount of risk, and if the House were fully conscious of that, the necessity would be seen of giving encouragement to businesses with a certain amount of risk but which could not be called wild speculation. He offered the right hon. Gentleman the assurance that this Bill was regarded with a great deal of satisfaction by a great many men engaged in business.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.): I think the full discussion upon this measure will be much more properly taken in Committee than at this stage. At the same time, there are one or two topics in the Bill which I will venture to discuss, though in no hostile spirit. The right hon. Gentleman may be well gratified with the reception which the Bill has received from all parts of the House. This Bill, I think, is a well-intentioned effort to meet a very unpleasant state of things, though I believe the acuteness of the position has been somewhat exaggerated. The right hon. Gentleman has enumerated the main points to which the remedial clauses of the Bill are directed. First, he mentioned the case of disclosing to the public the amount which a director pays for his shares as a qualification, and the necessity that these shares should be paid for by him in cash. Now, I venture to suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that the remedy which he proposes is purely chimerical. What he aims at is the destruction of the guinea-pig director. Now, the guinea-pig director is a person who receives fees amounting to, say, £200 per annum, and he will be required, under the clause, to find some qualification of probably not more than £200. To insist that he shall find that £200 out of his own pocket, and to think that by so insisting you are going to get rid of the guinea-pig director, is a pure delusion. It is perfectly evident that if he has not got the money himself he will obtain it by some elusive method from some one of the promoters, or will provide himself with £200 from outside, in order to secure an annual remuneration of £200. You will not by this provision in the slightest degree militate against the guinea-pig director. I do not know any means by which you will be able to prevent that class of persons serving on a Board of Directors except by compelling all directors to hold a substantial and proportionate amount of the capital of the company. Of course, few do that, and you will find great difficulty in obtaining directors of companies. You would also lose the services of very useful men. I would urge another objection. There are numerous instances in which a person is connected with a family business or a firm, where the qualification of director is not £200, but much heavier. It may be desirable that he should serve on the Board, but he probably cannot, or may not find it convenient to find the large qualification necessary, but the firm or family business with which he is associated find the money for that purpose, and the man might be made a most useful director. I know from my own experience that by the clause as it stands, he would be prevented being appointed, because of the necessity imposed on him of having the qualification in his own right. There is one other point to which I desire to call attention. There was an excellent provision in the Bill, in spite of what was being said against it, to give a priority to trade creditors. I cannot help thinking that in abandoning that provision, the right hon. Gentleman has struck at the root of the Bill. For example, here is a company formed with a capital of £50,000, £25,000 as debentures, and £25,000 as shares. The real value of the property is only £25,000, the £25,000 of share capital being a pure figment. The company commences its operations and runs into £20,000 of debt. The creditors observe that the company has a capital of £50,000, and they trust it. The company comes to grief, and the mortgagees are very likely able to appropriate every scrap of the property, to the exclusion of those creditors who have trusted it on the faith of the capital of £50,000. I know that objection to the right hon. Gentleman's original provision was taken by influential business men, but I think that in the interests of the commercial community at large, it would be wise for him to reconsider the position he has now taken up. I do not like to differ from my hon. and learned friend, but I cannot help thinking that the provisions of Clause 12 meet the point that he raised that the profits made by the immediate vendor to the company are not disclosed. I cannot help thinking that sub-section (f), associated as it is with sub-section (j), does compel the vendor to the company, or the company on its own part, to disclose to the public not only the amount paid to the immediate vendor but the amount paid by him to the vendor from whom he purchased. I do not at this time wish to engage the attention of the House further, but I think it would be desirable if the right hon. Gentleman would consider these two points.

*MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I do not wish to detain the House long, particularly after the very long, not to say exhaustive, debate which has taken place on the subject. My principal object in rising is to give expression to the views of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce and the Liverpool Law Society with respect to the Bill. I can in the first place join in the almost unanimous expressions of welcome on the part of the House with respect to the Bill. I think we all feel that this Bill is greatly wanted. Public opinion is quite ripe for a reform of company law, and I think the provisions of the scheme which the Government have been so long preparing will in a large measure meet the requirements of the case. It cannot be denied that the operation of the system of limited liability has been of enormous advantage to the country, as has been pointed out in the course of the debate. It is a system well suited for those great undertakings by which the commerce of this country is to a large extent conducted. It has afforded opportunities for the investment of capital which would otherwise have remained idle and unprofitable, but at the same time the system of limited liability has been greatly abused. Opportunities have been taken by unprincipled men to bring before the public bogus companies, and there is a strong feeling that something ought to be done to stop these abuses. Reference was made by my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade to the losses arising to this country from the insolvency of limited companies. I think he said that the losses were, comparatively speaking, small compared to the enormous amount of capital invested in public companies. That may be true, still I think we must all admit that it has been very great and very serious. In illustration of this I would refer to the motion which I myself moved, and which the House granted, on the subject of loss by companies in 1896. A return of companies wound up in 1896 was issued by the House of Commons in August, 1899. It shows that the number of companies wound up in that year was 1,261. In connection with 334 of these there was no probable loss, while with respect to 252 no returns had been obtained. With regard to the remaining 675 companies the loss to the shareholders amounted to £13,227,225, and to creditors £1,978,136, making a total of £15,205,411. If, as regards the 252 companies wound up, and of which no returns had been obtained, we estimate the loss in proportion to the loss in connection with the 675, we get a sum of £5,846,000, and thus we arrive at a sum total loss to creditors and shareholders of £21,051,411. Of course, the task of discriminating between the use and abuse of limited liability is one of great delicacy. We must be careful in rooting up the tares lest we root up the wheat also. So far as my limited knowledge goes I endorse the opinion that the Bill is an honest attempt to meet the difficulties of the case. One of the principal causes of the failure of companies is the remissness of directors. I agree with the Bill in so far as it seeks to bring home to directors their real responsibility, but I agree with the President of the Board of Trade that we must not go too far in this direction. While taking such steps as may be necessary to prevent directors so far as possible from evading their responsibilities, we must not place on them obligations which would prevent men of character and repute from acting as directors. The President of the Board of Trade said that we must be careful not to make the obligations on a board of directors too onerous, but I cannot help thinking some of the clauses of this Bill are of that character. Let me take one by way of illustration—Clause 9, which requires that in every case of an allotment of shares a return should be made by the company to the Registrar within seven days. If there should be default, and if the directors know of it, they are to be severally liable to a fine of £50 for each day that the default lasts. That is a very serious penalty indeed. I think it is going too far. Although that penalty may never be imposed, yet the fact that it is on the Statute-book may prevent men thoroughly qualified from taking these positions. A further clause relates to inadequate descriptions in prospectuses, and I agree with the Hon. Member for South Leeds in doubting whether its provisions are sufficiently stringent to disclose the real interest of the original vendor. I think I may say that feeling is shared by many others. It may be generally stated that, throughout the Bill, sufficient exemption is not made in the case of private companies. I think that with reference to companies which do not appeal to the public, several clauses will have to be modified. With regard to statutory meetings it may be that what is proposed in the Bill is a very desirable arrangement; but the provision that at the first statutory meeting any subject may be discussed is open to objection, because it is felt that this latitude may be abused by people who get into companies by taking shares for the purpose of injuring the companies. The clauses in respect to the registration of mortgages have been generally approved, and I heartily participate in that approval; but to enable persons interested in provincial companies to obtain the benefit of this arrangement, it has been suggested that it would be very desirable if copies of the entries in the register could be sent to the County Court of the district where a company is interested, so that the people on the spot may be able to get the information required. In regard to the matter of auditors, I think that the description of their duties in the Bill is insufficient. It is necessary, not only in the interest of the shareholders but in the interest of the auditors themselves, that they should know what their duties are. It is very desirable that there should be some clear definition of what is required of auditors, and in particular that they should report whether, in their opinion, full and fair balance-sheets have been drawn up.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Mr. HEDDERWICK, Wick Burghs). House counted, and forty Members being found present,

*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (continuing) said: There are one or two defects in the Bill I wish to call attention to. One is the preference given to debts contracted within three months of winding up. I am very glad to learn from the right hon. Gentleman that the clause is to be withdrawn, and also the medical clause. I hope this Bill will pass through. If we wait for a perfect Bill we will never have any Bill at all. We have in this Bill the foundation of a good and useful measure. I trust that the structure raised on that foundation will be one free from the difficulties of the present situation, and one which will hand down in increased measure the benefits of the limited liability system.

*MR. HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham): I should like, as a business man, to thank the President of the Board of Trade for what has now been done with the view of redeeming some of the pledges which have existed many years that there should be some legislation in regard to company law. I can testify that at various meetings of chambers of commerce throughout the country there have been resolutions passed in this direction for many years past, but, unfortunately, little or no progress has been made. Of course the Bill which is now before us is in no sense an ambitious measure. It does not profess for a moment to deal with all the evils which have attended company promotion, but I think the fact of this not being an ambitious measure will be all the more likely to ensure its passing during the present session. I thoroughly endorse the position which the President of the Board of Trade has taken up in regard to the extreme undesirability of legislating so as to have the effect of deterring responsible men from undertaking directorships. I think the first object should be to get the best men to serve on the boards of limited companies, and then, having secured them, to see that they shall exercise reasonable care and diligence in the discharge of their duties. It is quite clear from the enormous increase in the number of joint stock companies during the last few years that they fulfil a public need, and not the least of these needs is that they enable an investor, without having himself a practical experience of business, to spread his capital over a great variety of businesses, and in that way to minimise the risk of losing his capital. I think it is a laudable object that the Board of Trade should make it hard for a joint stock company to begin business unless there should be an adequate supply of capital. Inadequacy of capital has been one of the most fruitful causes of disaster in joint stock companies. While all the material information should be given in the prospectus, it is of the utmost importance not to take away from the investor the sense of responsibility for examining for himself as to the details of the concern and forming his own opinion as to its prospects of success. I am glad there is a clause in the Bill providing for the publication of the commission paid to underwriters. I am aware that some chambers of commerce have suggested that such commission should be limited to 20 per cent. I must say that I do not myself concur in any such limitation. I think the amount of the commission may well be left entirely unlimited, provided only that the amount of that commission shall be set forth in the prospectus. I think Clause 13 will be somewhat impracticable of application in the case of very large concerns, for I see it prohibits a company from varying the terms of any contract it may have entered into without complying with very considerable formalities. This may operate harshly when it is desired to alter the remuneration of managers and others with whom agreements may have been made. I am glad that the President of the Board of Trade does not favour the giving of priority to new creditors over debenture holders. I think it might have been to some extent justifiable to give that priority had there been no registration whatever of those debentures or mortgages; but in view of the stipulation that those securities shall be registered their position ought to be inviolable, and no new creditor should be allowed to take precedence over them. I think the seven days mentioned in the Bill is a period entirely inadequate, and I think the President of the Board of Trade has himhimself recognised this. It is stipulated that the mortgages shall be open to the inspection of the members and the creditors of a company. It might be well not to limit the inspection to the members and creditors, because there are many individuals who, though not creditors now, might contemplate becoming creditors, and if they were not to be allowed access to the documents until actually becoming creditors I think a real hardship would be inflicted upon them. I entirely concur with some observations made by previous speakers that there should be no discouragement of the gift of the necessary qualification in shares in certain instances to men to become directors. Having had considerable experience of manufacturing districts in the North, I can testify that very often the most desirable class of men to get on the boards are men who have had practical experience of their respective businesses —men who have the brains but not very much capital—and if the gift of qualifying shares to them is to be discouraged, I think a very undesirable step will be taken. I cordially agree with the hon. and learned Member for South Leeds that there is a very great abuse in the existence of founders' shares in certain companies. I am sorry that that evil is not touched on at all under this Bill, but I recognise that it is impossible to deal with all the abuses which exist without making the Bill exceedingly cumbrous, and to that extent diminishing its chances of passing into law, and therefore I cordially welcome the introduction of the measure, and shall do what I can to help it to pass into law.

*MR. MARKS (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I think the course of the debate has exhibited a singular and welcome unanimity in reference to the character of the measure, and an equal unanimity with reference to the necessity for some legislation to remove existing evils in connection with the administration of the Joint Stock Companies Act. It has been frankly said by the right hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill that this measure does not aim at removing all the evils which now exist. It will, therefore, possibly be sufficient for the House at this stage to address itself to the question of whether the remedies proposed so far as they go are of the character best calculated to accomplish the end the measure has in view. I cannot help thinking that rather undue importance is attached to the question of the qualification of company directors. I do not think that anyone acquainted with joint stock company enterprises will believe for a moment that any considerable part of the evils which arise from them is due to a lack of qualification—that is, pecuniary qualification—on the part of the directors therein concerned. It does not follow that because a director is a large shareholder he is therefore better qualified to direct the affairs of the company. Indeed, the much abused "guinea-pig" is sometimes a very competent director of company interests. He is not infrequently a retired Government official, possibly with colonial or military experience, who is content to supplement the meagre pension which the liberality of the nation bestows upon him by the few hundreds a year which he can derive from the administration of the affairs of a company. I am bound to say that in my experience he is not at all infrequently a very competent person for that work. He may be called upon to attend board meetings two or three times a week, and the £300 or £400 a year which he derives from the two or three companies with which he is connected, while they do constitute a very substantial and welcome addition to his income, are, at the same time, fairly earned by him in his attendance at board meetings and in his general supervision of the business of the companies. To imagine that any real advantage would result to shareholders if the qualifications of these professional directors were set forth in the memorandum of association, or in the prospectus of a company, seems to me to be an idle dream. It may be that a director will buy his own 100 shares; it may be he will get a friend to buy them for him. The man who can earn £250 a year by being a director of a company can always find some one willing to put up the £100 necessary to buy the shares which constitute his qualification. Then comes the question of the prospectus. I would like to suggest to my right hon. friend that the provisions in respect of the prospectus are calculated to cut both ways. To a certain extent, it is true, a great advantage would accrue to the public from setting forth in the prospectus of every company the full particulars which by this Bill the prospectus should contain. But the provisions with reference to the prospectus are to apply only to a company which is about to make a public issue of shares. It is notorious that some of the very worst company scandals which have occurred in the City, at any rate in the past fifty years, have been in connection with companies which never issued prospectuses at all. That is true not only in reference to colonial companies, and South African companies, and foreign companies, but to British companies, while with regard to American companies no prospectus is ever issued in England. If these are important safeguards which are provided in this Bill, it seems to me that they will fall far short of accomplishing what is desired if they cannot be in some way extended to all companies whether they do or do not make a public appeal for subscriptions. It might be urged that this is impracticable. I suggest that it is not impracticable, and I would invite the right hon. Gentleman to consider for a moment whether the filing of a prospectus might not well be made a condition precedent to the registration of any limited liability company. What is the present situation with respect to a company which is brought out without a prospectus? In the first place, no one is responsible, no misrepresentations can be made, the whole of the shares are issued in the first place to the vendor or his nominee, and those shares are got off through the Stock Exchange or some other agency. There is another evil in connection with this matter of the non-prospectus company. It seems to me that one of the chief requirements in connection with the Amendment of the Joint Stock Companies Act is this, that as soon as possible it should be rendered impossible, or at any rate as difficult as possible, for a bankrupt trader to avail himself of the Joint Stock Companies Act for the purpose of defrauding his creditors. That is, in my judgment, one of the commonest and one of the most crying of the present evils. What is the position under the Bill we have before us? A bankrupt trader forms himself into a joint stock company with the aid of certain clerks of the solicitor whom he employs. The shares are issued to him, and they are peddled out among the creditors to a certain extent, and to a certain extent they are peddled out, if it is a large enterprise, through reputable stockbrokers; if it is a small enterprise, then through the disreputable circularising stockbroker. In any case, he gets rid of the shares in some way or other. Under this Bill he is under no obligation whatever to disclose any fact with respect to his business, and nothing is commoner than for a small tradesman who knows he is on the eve of bankruptcy to turn himself into a joint stock company and to get out of his liability. It is as common as having a fire, and is more effective. I would earnestly urge upon the right hon. Gentleman, if, as it is clear, the authors of this Bill believe the prospectus is the vital part of the joint stock company scheme, that a prospectus should be insisted upon whether a company makes a public issue of its shares or whether it does not. Then there is the statutory meeting. In respect of this I think some careful consideration should be given, even in the early stages of the Bill. Up to recent times the statutory meeting has been—I will not say a convivial gathering, but at any rate quite an informal gathering, at which the chairman usually explained to the shareholders that they were called together, not that he has anything to say or that there is anything for them to do, but because the eccentricities of Parliament require it, to comply with certain formalities. It is proposed under this Bill to make the statutory meeting a very important meeting. It is proposed, indeed, as it seems to me, to make of it an occasion for a thorough investigation of the company in its very earliest stages. I think that is a very desirable thing, but we must see to it that the provision of the Bill does not defeat its own purpose. I can discover nothing in the Bill to prevent a company from holding its statutory meeting before the issue of its shares. If I am right in my reading of the measure, that would defeat the obvious purpose you have in view. First you form your company; then you get your directors; then you hold your statutory meeting; then, having complied with the statutory requirements, but not until then, you issue your shares. You have then got a long run before you, during which you are under no obligation to call the shareholders together or give any account of the progress of their enterprise. Then there is the question of commissions for underwriting. At the present time I think I am right in saying there is no limit to the amount of underwriting commission that may be paid for the placing of shares under any circumstances. But Clause 10 of the Bill before us only provides that it shall be lawful for a company to pay a commission upon any offer of shares for public subscription, and that, if I read the Bill correctly, would exclude the payment of commission under any conditions other than those of public subscriptions. In the event of a private placing of shares or debentures no broker would be entitled to receive any commission, and no company would be entitled to pay any commission. So that it seems to me that, while apparently and ostensibly legalising the present practice, the Bill would really be limiting an existing right. In regard to the payment of preliminary expenses I cannot help thinking that the Bill weakens rather than strengthens the present law. It is provided that no company may proceed to allotment excepting under certain conditions, and may not proceed with any business until certain formalities have been complied with. I am referring now to Clause 8. But under Sub-section 3 it is provided that nothing in this section should prevent any company paying or contracting to pay any preliminary expenses. In other words, there is no limit to the amount of preliminary expenses the promoters may defray. They may fail to get the amount of money which they have set forth in their memorandum of association as the minimum upon which they will proceed to allotment, and having failed to obtain that minimum they may not proceed to allotment, and, being unable to proceed to allotment, they may not go on with any business, and they must keep the money they have received intact except in so far as they may pay that money away for the purposes of what are called "preliminary expenses." That is a very vague term; and assuming, as we must assume, that this most welcome Bill is aimed at the dishonest company promoter, it does seem to me to open the door to him to do things without incurring any penalty, which at present he is unable to do. If some limit were put upon this matter there would be some protection afforded to the public; but, as it stands, assuming a dishonest promoter with a dishonest scheme, assuming the public refuse to rise to his bait, the dishonest promoter is still at liberty to use all the money he happens to receive for the purpose of what he may call his "preliminary expenses." There are one or two other points to which at a later stage of the Bill I shall venture to direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman. At present I would confine myself to this observation. In so far as the Bill fails to touch the case of the non-prospectus company it fails in its purpose. In so far as it deals with the question of commission it cuts down an existing right and substitutes no equal right in its place. In respect of the registration of mortgages even, if I am correctly informed, it affords no additional facilities to those which already exist. In conclusion let me refer to one other point—namely, the right of a shareholder who has applied for shares to claim the cancellation of his allotment in the event of any irregularity. He is limited under this Bill to one month, and it is stated specifically that he may not apply for a rectification of the register later than one month. I would call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact that that limits an existing right. If these points should be dealt with at some future stage of the Bill I cannot doubt that the measure will accomplish a great deal of good; but the chief object to be achieved, namely, the protection of the public—not only the share-investing and the share-speculating public, but the legitimate trading public—from the present evils which arise from the flotation as companies of the businesses of bankrupt tradesmen cannot be effectively dealt with unless at some stage of this Bill we can provide a means to prevent an insolvent trader from turning his business into a company for the purpose of foisting the shares upon the public, either for cash or its equivalent, without as a condition precedent to obtaining registration he shall have filed at Somerset House something which, for purposes of any possible litigation, will serve the object of a prospectus at all stages.

*MR. BUTCHER (York): I welcome this Bill as a very businesslike and practical method of dealing with a subject of vast importance not merely to the commercial classes, but to that enormous mass of people who may be described as the investing public. I welcome it all the more because it is not of too ambitious a character. We must remember that by far the great majority of companies and of company directors are honest, and we must beware lest in endeavouring to suppress dishonesty we render it impossible for any gentleman of position and honour to engage in the directorate of a joint stock company. The main principle upon which this Bill is founded is that of giving full information to the persons chiefly interested — the shareholders and the creditors or the intending shareholders and the intending creditors. If that information is given it is for them to say whether they will deal with or invest in the company, and, provided they get ample information, it is their own fault if they either invest in or deal with a company which turns out unsatisfactorily. That, to my mind, is a great merit of the Bill. Another merit of the measure is that it strangles dishonest companies in their inception. The great majority of dishonest companies get money from the public and go into speedy liquidation. This Bill, if it is effective, will prevent those companies coming into existence. At an early stage the company will be stopped, and the promoters and other persons who are intending to profit by it will be deprived of their booty. There are only two points in the Bill to which I desire to call attention, but they are points which I venture to think are of very great importance. One is the question of the prospectus. The Bill provides, and properly provides, that a considerable number of matters affecting the company, and which naturally affect the mind of intending shareholders, should be specified in the prospectus. But what I do not find in the Bill, which I think it would be advantageous to have there, is some more specific remedy in case of non-compliance with the provisions of Clause 12. I do not see what is to happen if this clause, which states what is to be included in the prospectus, is not complied with. It may be said, and possibly truly, that Clause 30 would in some cases make it a misdemeanour on the part of promoters issuing a prospectus which does not comply with the requirements, and would subject them to punishment accordingly. That may be, but what I want to know is what civil remedy has the shareholder who invests money on the faith of such a prospectus? It may be said he would have an action for damages, but what I think he should be entitled to is some means of getting rid of his shares. The Bill says the prospectus ought to contain certain things. It seems to me that a man who has applied for shares on the faith of a prospectus ought to be entitled to get his money back if it turns out that the prospectus is not in accordance with law. That is a matter in which the Bill could be amended in Committee if necessary. There is another clause which to my mind is of enormous importance—namely, the clause relating to the registration of mortgages. My hon. friend says that that does not strengthen the existing law. I rather think he is in error there, because although the existing law provides for the registration of mortgages properly so called, it does not provide for the registration of debentures. This is a very important fact. Let me give the House one specific case which I am afraid is of very frequent occurrence, where the non-registration of debentures causes great loss to shareholders and creditors. A man owns a failing business, and sells it to a company which is formed for the purpose of buying it. The purchase money is taken chiefly in debentures. The company, after a short and inglorious existence, goes into liquidation. In the meanwhile the public have subscribed money for taking up shares in this company, and trade creditors have supplied goods to the company without receiving payment. When the company goes into liquidation in comes the vendor, and these debentures swallow up every fraction of the assets of the company, and the trade creditors and the shareholders lose their money. The Bill provides for the registration of all debentures, and if, when a creditor sees a very large number of debentures registered, he chooses to trade with the company, all I can say is that it is his own fault if he suffers. On the general aspect of the Bill I should like to refer to a point mentioned by the hon. Member for St. George's and the hon. Member for Rotherham. They appeared to think there was no harm in the practice of giving qualifying shares. I hold the strongest opinion that that is a most dangerous method by which to qualify directors. Where does this qualification come from? In nine cases out of ten it comes from the promoter, and the gentleman who gets the shares, consciously or unconsciously, in nine cases out of ten, becomes the tool and carries out the objects of the promoter. I am extremely glad that the Bill proposes that any person who undertakes the responsible duties of a director of a joint stock company, in which he is bound not only by law but by honour and duty to do the best he can for the interests of the shareholders, shall not be qualified by the promoter, or by some other persons whose interests may be directly antagonistic to those of the shareholders. On the whole I am glad to support this Bill, because I think as it stands it will provide, as far as possible, a remedy against many of the abuses which now exist, and it will not act as a deterrent to responsible persons acting as directors of companies.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I think there must be a feeling on both sides of the House, and especially on the part of gentlemen who have had long experience of the ordinary commercial routine of business life, that the right hon. Gentleman, by pressure behind him, has withdrawn one of the most important clauses of the Bill. There must be a feeling of great regret amongst those who represent the commercial classes of the country that the right hon. Gentleman has withdrawn the clause dealing with debentures. I did hope that we should have a clause dealing with fraudulent cases only, where the issue of debentures has been a fraud upon the ordinary trade creditors. All who have had any commercial experience know how very easy it is to turn a concern into a limited company worth £10,000 when it is going steadily down hill. It is all done as a sort of family affair. You give debentures for the £10,000, which is the real value of it, and you go into the market for the rest. Practically you go into the open market and you buy goods to the extent of

£10,000. The ordinary shareholders never get anything, the debenture holders foreclose, and then there is nothing for the ordinary creditors. In small businesses this is done to a very considerable extent, and the Judges have pointed this out repeatedly. Surely the ingenuity of the Government or the Members of this House could devise a provision to meet the particular case of fraudulent debenture holders. I hope that in Committee a clause will be produced dealing with this particular class of fraud in getting money from the ordinary trade creditors. I do hope the Government will reconsider this question. There are other serious questions in regard to which this Bill ought to go a little further. There is too much fraud in other companies which the Government will have to face eventually, but whilst this Bill deals in only a limited way with a great subject, I believe the House will support the Government in passing to a successful issue a Bill which is honestly attempting to deal with a great question.

Mr. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down in regretting that the Government have withdrawn the clause dealing with debentures. On the contrary, I think that clause was a great blot on the Bill, and I am extremely glad that they have undertaken to withdraw it. As far as I understand, it is not possible to pass a law in this or any other Parliament which will prevent every species of fraud. Frauds will occur and people will invest their money foolishly, whatever we do to safeguard their interests. The hon. Gentleman argues that a company is made by the debenture holders to enter into bargains to make profits for themselves, and that the shareholders get nothing. I would point out that as far as my experience goes it is the shareholder who enters into contracts with the traders, and if people are foolish enough to give them credit without first ascertaining that they are in a position to justify that credit, then they must take the risk. I was sorry to hear the hon. Member say that he viewed with regret the clause as to the qualification of directors. I should say that clause was about the best in the Bill. The idea that a director should receive his qualification from somebody else has been the cause of the many failures of companies that have occurred during the last few years. It is quite true that you may possibly have some official of the company who thoroughly understands the business and yet has no capital, but that man should not be made a director, but an officer of the company. A director should certainly have a direct interest in the company, and the class of people anxious to add £150 or £200 to their income as a sort of supplementary income are the worst class of directors you can possibly have. You want business men with business qualifications to take the position of director, and they should have a large interest of their own in the particular company of which they are directors. A man who has had no business experience at all is the very worst class of director you can get. I am very glad indeed that the Government have introduced this clause into the Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. RITCHIE: I beg to move that this Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Trade. I regret that I find myself out of accord in regard to this motion with several hon. Members of the House whose opinions are entitled to the greatest respect. But the question is, does the House honestly desire that this measure should be passed into law during the present session? If it does, then I think the most effectual way of doing that is to refer the Bill in the ordinary way to the Standing Committee. If a Bill of this kind is not one of those which can properly be referred to the Standing Committee, then I might complain that that institution does not fully carry out and fulfil the objects for which it was set up. Anyone who has been present, and who has gone through a complicated Bill on the Standing Committee, must know that the discussions on those Committees are of a much more business character than they are in nine cases out of ten when discussed by a Committee of the whole House. I know it is said that the meetings of the Committee are held at a time when many hon. Members cannot conveniently attend; but I wish to point out that there is a full opportunity when the Bill comes back before the House on the Report stage to discuss any particular matter which any hon. Member desires to discuss. I hope the House will support the Government in their anxious desire to pass this measure into law, and will agree to the reference to the Standing Committee on Trade.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

MR. LAWSON WALTON: It is obvious that the reference which the right hon. Gentleman has proposed will limit very largely the area of suggestion in regard to this measure. One or two hon. Members who have spoken asked that the whole House in Committee should be allowed to consider this scheme. They pointed out the personal inconvenience in regard to attendance during the time which the Standing Committee conducts its business. It is obvious that this course will limit very largely the number of Members who will take part in the further consideration of this measure. It is also obvious that it will shut out a number of hon. Members who are personally familiar with the administration of the existing law, and who could give great assistance to the right hon. Gentleman if he wishes to carry a measure that will be of permanent utility to the future administration of this important legislation. I cannot conceive that this House has not time between this and the month of August to dispose of this measure. We certainly should not occupy a very long period in discussing the details of the Bill in this House, and the experience of a larger number of Members would not be unfruitful of suggestions which the right hon. Gentleman would be likely to consider. I fail to see any reason whatever for sending this measure upstairs to a Committee of which many of us are not members, and where many of us will not be able to attend, especially in regard to a measure in which so many Members of this House are so deeply interested.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I wish to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the constitution of the Standing Committee upon Trade is somewhat peculiar. If he casts his eye over the names he will come across many hon. Members who will admit that they are in no way well qualified to deal with this subject. Moreover, it is a question in which the outside public take a great interest. When the matter is disposed of upon the floor of this House we have the assistance of the comments in public journals, which is not always available in regard to proceedings upstairs. The session is not yet near its conclusion, and I think it would be possible to deal with this question before a Committee of the whole House.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I trust the right hon. Gentleman will allow this Bill to go before a Committee of the whole House. This Bill affects Ireland, and no part of the country has been more victimised by bogus companies than Ireland. There are very few Members from Ireland on the Committee on Trade, and very little opportunity is afforded to point out the defects which there are in this measure if you send it to a Select Committee. Besides this, the experience of those hon. Members who have had to deal with the company law in a professional way is most material and of great advantage, and the Committee suggested includes hardly any lawyers. I notice that the Chancellor of the Exchequer smiles at that remark, but we know that it is his idiosyncrasy to think that the world would get on better if there was no law and no lawyers. We in Ireland, however, have always been particularly respectful to the law, but this is really a serious matter, and a change is being made which vitally concerns that part of the United Kingdom, and we have not had an ample opportunity of discussing this Bill on the Second Reading. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why?] Because we were anxious to facilitate the progress of the measure. The question is why should we not discuss so serious a Bill as this in a Committee of the whole House, where every section of the kingdom will be represented. The course suggested seems to be utterly unreasonable. We all know that a great deal of the mischief which this Bill is intended to obviate arose from the defects in the earlier Bills of 1862 and 1867, and if those Bills had been closely watched and adequately discussed, probably the opportunity would never have arisen that has taken place of fleecing the public, especially of Ireland, through the medium of bogus companies.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I will not argue the wider and almost irrelevant question of the maintenance of law and order in Ireland, but I will come to the narrower issue which is immediately before the House. I submit that one or two of the arguments which have been adduced in favour of sending this Bill to a Committee of the whole House ought not to have very much weight. One of them is that introduced by the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite to the effect that there is not a sufficient number of lawyers upon the Standing Committee on Trade. So far as that is concerned, it is a misfortune which can be remedied quite sufficiently to meet the general view of hon. Members on both sides of the House. Another argument to which I do not attach great weight is that used by my hon. friend, who says that the Grand Committee on Trade would not from day to day have the advantage of the commentary of the daily press. I do not know that that is an argument which ought to have very much weight in influencing the decision which we have to come to to-night. The real argument against sending this measure to the Grand Committee on Trade is that certain hon. Gentlemen in this House who, by their professional knowledge, are most qualified to deal with the technical details raised by this Bill, are prevented by their daily vocations from attending the sitting of the Grand Committee without putting themselves to considerable inconvenience. I think that is an argument of considerable weight. But if I may judge by the reception which this Bill has received upon the present occasion, there is no probability that the discussions in the Grand Committee will be of a protracted character. I should imagine that one or two days at the outside would be quite sufficient to deal with this Bill. [Cries of "No."] That, at any rate, is the opinion of those who are best qualified to advise me in the matter.

MR. LAWSON WALTON: It would take two nights in the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then that is a sufficient reason for taking the course we have suggested, but I will leave that point and return to the main current of my observations. Let it be remembered that the Grand Committees were created for the very purpose of dealing with Bills of this kind. It is a Bill which has no party flavour about it, which raises no popular passions, no great political isues, but which does deal with important details in commerce or in trade; and it is exactly that type of Bill for which the Grand Committee system was instituted. I think it would be a very serious commentary upon that institution, and a very serious blot upon its utility, if the House were now to refuse to send this Bill to the Grand Committee because some hon. Gentlemen think it would be difficult for them to serve. My hon. friend who has just sat down pointed out that by the constitution of the Standing Committee on Trade many hon. Members would be excluded who are specially qualified to add weight and lustre to that Committee. I would point out, however, that the constitution of that Committee is elastic, and there is a possibility of adding fifteen members to the Committee, and I am sure that number would include all the specially qualified Members of this House who do not at present serve on that Committee. Therefore, I think that argument falls to the ground. Those who are better qualified than I am to judge inform me that in every Bill of this kind there is a special advantage in being able to be in touch with the Minister in charge of the Bill, and to have the draughtsman close at hand to be able to draw up Amendments which the discussion on the Bill seem to render necessary. That is not the case in our discussions in the House, so that there are real advantages in the machinery of the Grand Committee which this House fails to provide. These are the reasons which induce the Government, with considerable reluctance, and on grounds which I think will commend themselves to the House at large, to maintain the view which we have expressed—that this Bill, by its character, by its reception, and by the nature of the discussion which is likely to arise, is exactly the kind of Bill which ought to be sent to the Grand Committee. I hope that my hon. friends will, in the first place, be able to help us upon that Grand Committee, and will in addition, when the Bill comes down to the House on the Report stage, urge before a larger audience any views which may not have received full development on the Committee upstairs. I hope the House will adhere to the motion made by my right hon. friend.

Question put.

House divided:—Ayes, 138; Noes, 52. (Division List No. 163.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Asher, Alexander
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beach,Rt.Hn.SirM.H.(Bristol
Beckett, Ernest William
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bethell, Commander
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burns, John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbysh.)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,JAusten(Worc'r
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H.Athole
Colville, John
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasg'w)
Courtney,Rt. Hn. Leonard H.
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,SirHoratioD(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hammond, Sir C. (Newcastle)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N.Louth)
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Holland, William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Jessel, Captain Herbert M.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, James
Langley, Batty
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Macaleese, Daniel
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Monckton, Edward Philip
Montagu, Hon. J. S. (Hants.)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton,Arthur H.A.(Deptf'd)
Murnaghan, George
Murray, Rt. Hn.A. G. (Bute)
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Dowd, John
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease,Herbert P. (Darlington)
Peel, Hon. W. R. Wellesley
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett,Rt.HnHoraceCurzon
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Steadman, William Charles
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whiteley,H.(Ashton-under-L.
Williams, Jos. Powell- (Birm.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.N.
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Wrightson, Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young,Commander (Berks,E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Caldwell, James
Cawley, Frederick
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dewar, Arthur
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William (Dublin)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Gibney, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harrington, Timothy
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
M'Crae, George
M'Ghee, Richard
Maddison, Fred.
Marks, Henry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Moss, Samuel
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pilkington,Sir G.A.(LancsSW
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wilson,Frederick W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson, Jos.H.(Middlesbr'gh)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T. (Hudders.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Lawson Walton and
Mr. H. C. Richards.

MONEY-LENDING BILL [Lords].

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [21st June] proposed to Question [21st June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And which Amendment was—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

*MR. MARKS (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) said there seemed to be a general consensus of opinion that the evils which had been disclosed by the practice of a certain class of money-lenders required to be dealt with by the legislature, and there could be no doubt that the recent exposures of money-lending vampires should be dealt with without delay. But, at the same time, the House did not desire that the treatment of the evils should be characterised by any injustice to any class, and it was a matter for careful consideration as to what extent they would be justified in making the Bill then before the House retroactive. Under the Bill, if it became law, it would not be only a matter of preventing evil in the future but of undoing contracts already effected. The Bill proposed to prevent the extortions and in many cases the swindles which had been perpetrated by men of the Isaac Gordon stamp under a variety of aliases, by requiring all money-lenders to register themselves as such in their own names. But for all practical purposes such an enactment, without further safeguards than the Bill provided, would not be worth the paper it was written upon. It was nothing more than playing to the gallery. Any money-lender who desired to carry on business had only to go to a highly respectable solicitor and incorporate himself into a company and the solicitor would be quite prepared to lend seven clerks as signatories to the articles of association, and these money-lenders under some alias or other in the form of a company could carry on business as before. It might be said that we could get behind the company, but that could not be done, because the shares could be issued to bearer, and Isaac Gordon, Limited, could carry on exactly the same as before the company was formed. A money-lender could form as many companies as he pleased, and the business could still be conducted under the alias of one or a dozen companies. Men of the Isaac Gordon type would be able to conceal themselves behind the Companies Act, and they would go a step further as a company than they did as private individuals. They would explain to their clients that under this Bill they could only lend at fifteen per cent., but they would further explain that they were only in a position to lend money to their own shareholders, and if the client was not a shareholder he would be told he would have to take forty-five £1 shares for every £100 advanced before any business could be entered into. The price of those shares added to the fifteen per cent. would bring it up to the traditional 60 per cent. What was a money-lender? Who was the money-lender who was to register himself? The definition given in the Bill was, "Every person whose business was to lend money or who advertised, or otherwise held himself out as carrying on that business." Solicitors held themselves out as carrying on that business. Were they to be included in the operation of the Bill. They were not exempted in definite terms; and if it was intended that they should be exempted, what became of the other classes—the capitalist who lent money on the Stock Exchange, who did not limit his interest to 15 per cent. or 30 per cent? If 15 per cent. was the limit imposed by the State great difficulty would be experienced in carrying over some mining accounts. These were points which ought to be considered, because, although the Bill was aimed at the 60 per cent. sharpers of the West End, it was not aimed at the highly respectable 30 per cent. capitalist in the City. It appeared to him that the only way in which a man could discover, if this Bill came into operation, whether he was a money-lender or not would be to get himself prosecuted, and then if he were convicted he would know he was a money-lender, but if he were discharged he would know he was not. He could not regard the Bill as a serious remedy for the great evil which undoubtedly did exist.

*MR. BUTCHER (York) said the hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House had shown the ingenious devices by which money-lenders would be able to keep outside the limits of this measure when it became law. He admired the ingenuity of the hon. Member, but he doubted the efficacy of his methods. Even if the hon. Gentleman were right there was no reason why the House should not pass a measure dealing with a great many of the evils complained of. He desired to remove one or two misconceptions with regard to the Bill. One misconception was that the Bill implied that all money-lenders were scoundrels and swindlers. Nothing in the Bill justified any such suggestion. Many money-lending transactions were most advantageous to the borrowers themselves. Many persons require a loan for a short time, and it was extremely advantageous for them to be able to get it even at a high rate of interest. There were many money-lenders in the country who carried on their business in a legitimate manner, as advantageous to the borrower as to themselves. At the same time considerable abuses had grown up which would have to be done away with. Another misconception was that this Bill aimed at the revival of the usury laws. If that were so he should oppose it. He believed any attempt to revive the usury laws would be both useless and wrong. A high rate of interest was by no means an indication of fraud. It often happened that a man could advantageously borrow for a short time at a rate of interest which would amount to a very high rate per annum. As to two-thirds of the Bill, there was practical agreement. The chief controversy had arisen as to Clause I. Clause I. of the Bill was a clause which ought to be supported, because it embodied the principle that where a money-lender was proved to have made a harsh and unconscionable bargain with a borrower the transaction might be reopened by the Court and adjusted. This was a principle which had for generations been acted upon in our Courts of Equity. The objection that this was an interference with freedom of contract was unsound, because there could be no freedom of contract where there was weakness on the one side, and advantage taken of that weakness on the other. Such a condition of things made it impossible that there could be any freedom of contract in the transaction. But if the clause was to be passed into law it would require amending in certain particulars. First it provided that where the Court "had reason to believe" that a certain state of things had arisen it might interfere. That must be altered so as to read "where the Court is satisfied on the evidence." A second point was this. The Bill provided that the Court had to be satisfied that the rate of interest charged by the money-lender exceeded the sum mentioned in the schedule. The amount of interest charged was not a criterion of the *bona fides* or the *mala fides* of the transaction, and he suggested that all mention of the rate of interest should be left out, and that it should be left to the Court to decide, upon all the circumstances of the case, whether or not a bargain was a harsh and unconscionable one. There was a third point. The great majority of these cases would come before the County Court. As the law stood, there was no appeal from the County Court on questions of fact; and, therefore, when the County Court had decided that a bargain was harsh and unconscionable, which was a question of fact, and had reopened the transaction, there could be no appeal. He thought it was important when giving County Courts this extended jurisdiction that we should subject them to a right of appeal. Such an amendment would have a double effect. It would make the County Court more careful, and probably would not greatly increase the cost, because the unconscionable money-lender would be very loth to advertise himself in a second Court. He supported the Bill because it would remedy admitted abuses, while it would not inflict any injustice upon a class in which there were many deserving and honourable members.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) congratulated the hon. Gentleman upon the access of an enthusiastic supporter of this somewhat extraordinary measure. The only other cordial speech in its favour was that delivered by the hon. the Secretary to the Local Government Board, and his parental relation to the Bill somewhat biassed his opinion in regard to the matter. The hon. and learned Member for York had no doubt enthusiastically defended the one clause of this measure which he should have thought would have elicited the condemnation of every legal Member of the House. His hon. friend was in favour of conferring upon a judicial tribunal the right of setting aside a bargain, not in accordance with the application of any defined legal principles, but in accordance with the view the members of that tribunal might take of certain abstract principles of humanity and philanthropy. They were to unmake a bargain, not because it was opposed to statute; they were not to determine that it involved a restraint of trade, or was against any defined principles; they were to have the assistance of no principle either from the common law or from statute, but they were to appeal to the realm of ethics or moral philosophy, and from the inner consciousness they were supposed, somewhat rashly, to possess, they were to come to the conclusion that the bargain was what the Bill described as "harsh and unconscionable." And if they arrived at that conclusion, without any control or appeal, the assent of the parties was to be set aside, and an entirely new contract was to be made by the Court. With all respect to his hon. friend, such a principle was absolutely foreign, he had almost said, to the jurisprudence of any civilised country; at any rate it was utterly unknown to our own. What reason had we to imagine that our judges were educated in any system which would entitle them to exercise this new jurisprudence with advantage to the community? Judges were sometimes lawyers; but what right had we to suppose that they were philanthropists? What reason had we to imagine that they had been educated in any system of humanity or ethics? How were we to infer that the average county court judge might take an enlightened view of what was harsh in the commercial relations between a lender and a borrower of money? And what assistance did we give him in arriving at the conclusion that the relation he was asked to adjudicate upon was unconscionable in its character? His hon. and learned friend the Attorney General had said that the opposition to this measure was founded upon a most complete misconception as to its real meaning. He would like the Attorney General to tell the House what meaning he attached to the word "harsh," and what was his abstract definition of the word "unconscionable"? Suppose that two men of adult age and average familiarity with affairs enter, on equal terms, and without any intention of fraud, into a contract, it might be to pay 60 per cent. for a loan of money for a short period, how were we to decide that it was "harsh"? Were we to appeal to the inner consciousness of the County Court Judge? If that Judge thought that 50 per cent. would have been enough, was he to set aside the transaction? What did the word "unconscionable" mean? Did it mean fraudulent? If so, the existing law was sufficient, because if a bargain were fraudulent it might be set aside as well as if the word "unconscionable" had been used. Did it mean harsh? If so, the word "harsh" was enough. So that we get a piece of rhetorical legislation by which a County Court Judge, on no defined principle or regulation to guide him, and subject to no review, was to set aside a bargain because in his opinion the borrower might have secured more favourable terms. In the very able and ingenious speech made by the hon. and learned Member for York, we were told that the application of principles of this kind was not unknown in the existing law, and that a Judge set aside a contract if it was in restraint of trade. But in such a case there were well-defined principles of law given to the Judge for application to the case. What was the real blemish in this measure, assuming that there was some case for a change in the law? The measure dealt solely with the harshness attending the initial transaction. It left out of sight altogether the harshness attending the enforcement of the bargain. The cases which appealed to the signatories of the Report of the Select Committee were nearly all cases in which the lender ruthlessly sought to impose his bargain at a time when the borrower was entirely at his mercy. The lender who has lent his money on terms might be guilty of great barbarity. The bargain of Antonio and Shylock was a bargain which Antonio applauded. The infamy was the enforcement of the contract. And so we might get a transaction on terms which were not unfair; but if the lender sought to enforce it at a time when the borrower was unable to pay, that difficulty could be dealt with by the existing law. This measure would introduce untold confusion into the administration of the law in this country. It was said that we would drive money-lending beyond the four seas, that we would force it underground and into subterfuges, and compel the money-lender to take refuge in subterranean channels. He was told that an entirely new department had been created in the jewellery trade—a man bought diamonds at 150 per cent. more than they were worth, and then borrowed money upon them, and left the diamonds in the hands of the lender as security for a loan. Another illustration was the incorporation of a company with the provision that the borrower should become a shareholder of the company. It was impossible, while there were men who wished to borrow money and had no credit, and men who wished to lend money, and were prepared to take the risk of its never being repaid, to prevent transactions of that kind. Then they would have in every County Court district a different standard as to what was harsh and unconscionable. One County Court Judge had announced that he would never enforce a bargain for a loan of money in which more than 5 per cent. was charged, no matter what the security might be. Another County Court Judge had decided that the borrower should have a fortnight's grace before being called upon to pay the money. Thus there would be districts in which the money-lender would flourish, and others in which he would be strangled out of existence. All this confusion would take place because there was not in the Bill any defined legal principle which could be applied to all these transactions. There was no specific test which could either be proved or disproved, but only the inner consciousness of a class of men who had no special experience in appeals to the principles of economics and humanity, to which the law did not apply. Having regard to that view, he appealed to the House not to give way to the sentiment which had produced this Bill. It had been produced with good intentions, but it would not yield the wished for results. An hon. Member had pointed out that there was an enormous discrepancy in the opinion of Judges as to the punishment of crime. Did we wish to extend that element of uncertainty into other branches of the law? If there was anything more deplorable than another in the administration of the law, it was the inequality of the sentences for offences against the person and larceny. The Home Office and the Judges themselves had very considerable perplexity in connection with the infliction of punishment attending the commission of crime, although there was a great body of tradition and a large body of opinion among the members of the judicial staff to assist them. But what would be the uncertainty if fifty-six tribunals in the country had cast upon them the duty, without any guide, to determine what they considered harsh and unconscionable! He quite agreed that the law required altering, and he would gladly have supported a moderate measure upon the lines the Attorney General seemed to have in his mind when he rose to support the Second Reading of the Bill. He said a good deal about the first clause; that we should register the money-lender, should regulate the carrying on of his trade, and prohibit issue of circulars to young men under age and improvident. All that was admirable, and if the Government had been content to introduce a measure of that class, and content with re-defining the common law of fraud, he would have supported it. Let them re-define the common law in all classes of fraud, and enact that, unless a money-lender could satisfy the Court that the borrower was a person of average intelligence with a fair knowledge of business, and thoroughly understood the interest he was to pay, and the conditions of his bargain, then the Court could set aside the bargain. He would go further and say, let the Government enlarge the common law of duress or provide a redefinition of duress, so that if it appeared that the money-lender was taking advantage of an apprehension of exposure and scandal on the borrower in making the bargain, then the bargain should be set aside. He would support such a measure, because there we should have a legal principle which would allow the Judge to determine its application to a particular case. But if we were to call upon the judicial body in the administration of jurisprudence to be guided by no principle except their own humanity and sympathies, then we would introduce into purely commercial transactions an element which would lead to confusion and be of no advantage to the community.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think it convenient to intervene at this stage, because I rather hope that after the time which has been devoted to the Bill the House may now come to a decision. I shall be very brief; and the first question I should like to ask the House is, what we are, on both sides of the House, agreed upon. I believe we are all agreed that the mere magnitude of interest charged on a sum of money is no reason for interfering with a bargain come to between lender and borrower. We are all agreed that an interest which, on the face of it, may seem extravagant, excessive, and, in the words of the Bill, almost harsh and unconscionable, may, if you look into the facts, prove an interest which does no more than secure the lender against the very probable failure of the borrower to repay the money. In other words, we are all agreed that we ought not, under a disguise, to attempt to revive the old and discredited usury laws. The second point on which we are all agreed is that there are some harsh, unconscionable, and tyrannical bargains to which it is absurd to apply the term freedom of contract at all—bargains which no moralist would support, which everyone would like to see broken, if they could be broken without the destruction of some very important principles. Where we differ is as to whether the particular machinery which the Bill provides for dealing with harsh and unconscionable bargains is of a kind which interferes illegitimately with freedom of contract between adult human beings, and whether the task we impose upon County Court Judges and other judicial authorities is a task which ought to be imposed on them and which they are competent to perform. On that point authorities differ in opinion. But let it not be supposed that there is agreement between the opponents of the Bill. The Bill has been opposed by hon. and learned Gentlemen on the other side of the House in very important speeches, not only for different reasons, but for reasons absolutely inconsistent with each other. There was the hon. and learned Member for West Fife, who interested and amused the House the other night for a considerable period, and was the first to lead the opposition to this Bill; and there was the hon. and learned Member for South Leeds. Well, these two learned Gentlemen are agreed upon nothing except in their opposition to the Bill. They absolutely and fundamentally differ otherwise. The hon. and learned Member for West Fife says that this equitable power to deal with harsh and unconscionable bargains is a power which from time immemorial has been inherent in our courts of law; that the principle of law which Clause 1 embodies is a principle of English law, and is not the creation of the revolutionary mind of my hon. friend the Under Secretary of the Local Government Board; on the contrary, it is a principle which all the greatest authorities on English law have for many generations extolled as one of the glories of our equity system. But the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down brushes aside with one wave of his hand the whole equity system of the country. He says: Are you going to ask Judges untrained in moral philosophy and in the humanities to seek in their inner consciousness for principles to apply to questions of fact, to questions of law, between man and man? The hon. and learned Member for West Fife declares that Her Majesty's Judges are sufficiently trained in the humanities and in moral philosophy to be able to extract from their inner consciousness the very principles by which problems of this kind are to be decided. The hon Member for South Leeds is not content with demolishing courts of equity and abolishing courts of criminal jurisprudence, but he tells us that we are already under the tyranny of moral philosophy and the humanities. He has explained to the House that you cannot avoid dealing with these problems; that every Judge who tries a criminal has to draw from his inner consciousness some moral estimate of the guilt of that criminal, and to apportion the sentence according to the estimate. Surely that is not a more difficult problem than is cast upon the Judges of the land by this Bill.

Mr. LAWSON WALTON: I say, do not extend it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. and learned Gentleman says the principle exists, but do not extend it; surely that implies that he dislikes the principle. I can say that by the confession of the lawyers in the House this kind of responsibility is, by the nature of the case, a responsibility which is forced on all the Judges, and has been deliberately undertaken by all our great Judges in equity. That being so, it seems to me that the argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman falls self-destroyed to the ground. Is it not as well to make the question clear on the face of our Statute-book that this kind of equitable jurisdiction which has been exercised by practical judges is really part of our law? I have been told, and I have no doubt the story is true, that there have been County Court Judges so impressed by the iniquity of bargains otherwise strictly accurate and correct brought before them that they have given some such decision as this—that the debtor is indeed liable for the full amount claimed by the creditor, but that he need not pay that full amount except at a rate of a penny a week, or some trifling sum which will finally extinguish the debt at the Day of Judgment. That is the argument which was so powerfully put before the House by my hon and learned friend the Member for Leamington. Is it a good thing that that kind of technicality should be forced on a Judge who feels that he is bound by his office to do equity? There is a famous instance of the way in which usurers may be used by technical courts, which the dramatic genius of Shakespeare has rendered immortal. For my own part, I have always thought that the expedient by which Portia demolished Shylock was one of the most abominable pieces of technical special pleading that ever was contrived. Yes; but it was forced upon the Court because they had not got this Bill. If the principle of my hon. friend's Bill had then been in existence we should, no doubt, have been deprived of a dramatic masterpiece; but, on the other hand, Shylock would, I think, have been treated in a manner far more consistent with the dignity of a court of law than he appears to have been on the occasion to which I have referred. [Laughter.] The House laughs, but really these considerations are worthy of being held in mind. My hon. friend's Bill has been admitted by its opponents not to be revolutionary in its dealings with the law of this country. I have stated that in the view of the Government we have no desire to revive the usury laws in any disguise whatever. What we do desire is to prevent gross acts of tyranny against a small and very helpless class. We do not think we are injuring the legitimate money-lender, who performs a most useful and important function in the general social organism. The only thing we interfere with is the extravagant exercise of his power, which, in every age and in every country, has brought his profession into disrepute, and which, in some countries, has even threatened the public and social order of the community in which he lived. In these circumstances, I have no hesitation in recommending the House to give the Bill a Second Reading. Any Amendments which do not touch the principle of the Bill may easily and with advantage be introduced in the Bill in Committee.

MR. BECKETT (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby): I am sorry not to find in the speeches of the Leader of the House and a number of other members of the Government any consciousness of the fact that they are dealing with interests of vast magnitude to the small traders of the country. If the Government inform the House before the Second Reading is taken that they intend in Committee to withdraw the schedule, it will greatly facilitate the passing of the Bill.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.) was understood to say that it was the intention of the Government to withdraw the schedule in Committee.

MR. BECKETT: That will remove many objections to the Bill. I feel sure if the Bill had been drawn up on the reasonable lines laid down by the hon. Member for York it would have been generally accepted; and I think if it is remodelled in Committee in that spirit it may prove a very useful measure. I do not propose to interfere with the discussion between the lawyers as to the extent of the moral consciousness to be exercised by the Judge. All I can say is that it ought to be the business of the Judge to administer the law as he finds it, and not as he thinks it should be. There is no doubt that this Bill deals harshly and unconscionably with the money-lending fraternity, as if they were thieves and liars. I venture to say that the borrowers are not always immaculate. According to Charles Lamb, the world is divided into borrowers and lenders, and the borrowers are "free, pleasant, jolly fellows," whereas the lenders are "harsh, disreputable gentlemen, who ought never to be seen except on business." If the world is divided between borrowers and lenders, it is inevitable that money will be lent, and the needs of the one and the other will determine the contract in either case. The question has been frequently asked, "What is a money-lender?" and the answer seems to me as difficult to ascertain as that other question, "What is truth?" My answer is that a money-lender is a dealer in money, just as a banker or a pawnbroker; but he has this disadvantage, that in 90 per cent. of cases the money-lender lends money without any security. That being so, he is entitled to fair protection, and certainly ought not to be singled out for condemnation in this way. My great objection to the Bill is the schedule, which fixes the rate of interest at 15 per cent., and I am very glad to hear from the Government that they are prepared to withdraw it, and to make concessions on the first clause. If they do that, they can make this a very useful measure to the community at large.

Mr. BIRRELL (Fifeshire, W.): I am not at all dissatisfied with the course of this debate, and I feel fully justified in the motion I made on a previous occasion, when the Bill was under discussion, for its rejection. But having regard to the concessions made by the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, and to what the First Lord of the Treasury said in his speech in reply to the speech of the hon. Gentleman opposite, I may by permission of the House ask leave to withdraw my Amendment. I understand that there is an actual promise to strike out any reference to 15 per cent. in the schedule, and that Clause 1 is to be amended to the effect that if a Judge has evidence before him in coming to a conclusion that the bargain was harsh and unconscionable it may be set aside, and that there is to be an appeal on that question from the County Court Judge. I cannot bind forty legions; if I could I would, but I do not want to put the House to the trouble of a division on a question of this sort. I only trust that the benevolent dispositions of the Government shown to-night will be carried out in Committee. I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I beg leave to move that the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law.

Mr. Beckett.

Mr. TOMLINSON (Preston): The Standing Committee on Law has more work before it already than it can do.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I will move that it be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade instead of the Standing Committee on Law.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc." (*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

Mr. BIRRELL: In reference to that, we have just sent a very important measure to the Committee on Trade, namely, the Companies Bill, which everyone will agree is of much greater importance to the community at large than this Bill. I do not see why the Committee of the whole House should abdicate its functions. The discussion will almost entirely turn on Clause 1, and there is no reason why, for once, we should not have that discussion in Committee of the whole House. I hope the House will not send the Bill to the over-burdened Standing Committee on Trade.

Mr. BECKETT also thought that the Bill should be remitted to Committee of the whole House.

Mr. LAWSON WALTON joined in the appeal for Committee of the whole House.

Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said that all the Bills before the Committee on Law were short Bills, and could be got through very quickly. It seemed to him that that Committee would be more suitable.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not gather that there is likely to be much difference of opinion regarding the principle of the Bill, and, as regards the drafting, I think that could be better done with a Grand Committee than with a Committee of the whole House. As regards the principle, that is a question which undoubtedly the House ought at some stage to pronounce upon, but I think the Report stage would be a very convenient time for that. The reason why the Government have selected the Grand Committee on Trade is because there is only one Bill before it, whereas there are four Bills before the Grand Committee on Law. Under the circumstances I am disposed to think that the motion of my hon. friend really represents the most expedient course to take.

COMMANDER BETHELL (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I would like to remind my right hon. friend and the House of the effect of sending too many Bills to the Standing Committees. The Grand Committees are often very badly attended, and the House would be astonished if it could see the attendance on some of the Bills sent up to them. I think it is open to doubt whether we ought to send so many Bills of such importance as we do to the Standing Committees. I do not oppose the motion, but I respectfully submit to the House a word of caution on this practice.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 150; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 164.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Rt Hn A H Smith-(Hunts
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bethell, Commander
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Broadhurst, Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burns, John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Channing, Francis Allston
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasg'w)
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw. T. D.
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, James
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Galloway, William Johnson
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt. Hn G J (St George's
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.
Hamond, Sir C. (Newcastle)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Holland, William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir William H.
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez Edw.
Johnston, Wm. (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Langley-Batty
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverp'l)
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Macaleese, Daniel
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
K'Killop, James
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Marks, Henry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Monckton, Edward Philip
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Murnaghan, George
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Penn, John
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. C.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edw.
Purvis, Robert

Renshaw, Charles Bine
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlepool)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Robinson, Brooke
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)

Sandon, Viscount
Seely, Charles Hilton
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Stanley, Ed. Jas. (Somerset)
Steadman, William Charles
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. M.

Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcrstersh. N.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wrightson, Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George

Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Asher, Alexander
Beckett, Ernest William
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Cawley, Frederick
Dewar, Arthur
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harrington, Timothy
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Maclean, James Mackenzie
M'Crae, George
Moss, Samuel
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wilson, Frederick W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Govan)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Lawson Walton and
Mr. Birrell.

CHARITABLE LOANS (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended, considered.

A clause (Part of 6 and 7 Vict., c. 91, s. 58, not to apply to proceedings under this Act)—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)—brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Another clause (Definition) — (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)—brought up and read the first and second time, and added.

It being Midnight, Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered upon Thursday.

CUSTOMS DUTIES (ISLE OF MAN) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (MR. HANBURY, Preston): The Bill is simply to give effect to an Act passed by the local legislature of the Isle of Man. Unless the Act is sanctioned by the Parliament of the United Kingdom it cannot remain in force longer than six months.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): How is the integrity of the Empire preserved?

Bill read a second time, and committed for Thursday next.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

Ordered, That Sir Albert Rollit be discharged from the Committee on Registration of Firms.

Ordered, That Mr. Cohen be added to the Committee.—(*Sir William Walrond.*)

WATER SUPPLY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

TRAMWAYS (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. HARRINGTON (Dublin Harbour): I hope the House will allow this Bill to be taken now. It is simply a Bill to remove certain difficulties which stand in the way of the construction of light railways in Ireland, and it assimilates the law of Ireland to the law in England. It is a measure which the Government ought to have introduced, and I can see no objection to it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): It is a controversial measure in many respects, and the Government cannot accept it without discussion.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): May I express the hope that the Attorney General will not take up a *non possumus* attitude towards this measure, but that he will approximate his mind to the views of Irish Members in the matter. We are only asking that the law of England should apply to Ireland, and we are now met in this unreasonable manner by the Attorney General.

MR. ATKINSON: I have carefully considered the matter, but we cannot accept the Bill without discussion.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I bet you will accept it before the session is over.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 27th June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

WEST HAM CORPORATION BILL.

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

"For the Abandonment of the London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Kirkintilloch; Glasgow; and Clydebank; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Govan, and Greenock; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Petition from South Kensington, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSED PREMISES (HOURS OF SALE) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Bowling, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Bowling, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS).

Two Petitions from Milford Haven, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HOUSES (SCOTLAND) LATER OPENING BILL.

Petition from Bowling, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Havant; Warsash; and Lichfield; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL, AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Two Petitions from Milford Haven, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against, from Doncaster (two); West Hartlepool; and Hartlepool; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Leicester (five); Tedburn St. Mary (two); Uffculme; Cheadle; Quarrington Hill; Page Bank; Saltford; Rhydfelen; Treforest; Porth; Clutton; Maidstone (two); Litcham; Temple Cloud; Warblington; Pentre; Rhosymedre; Cheshire; Keynsham; Bontuchel; Aston; Renton; Lutterworth; Mount Sorrell; Sheffield (two); Bowling; Sandford;

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Yarnscombe; Helensburgh; Merthyr Tydfil; Brighton; Llanwnda; Elland; Upper Gornal (three); Aberystwith; Brecon; Brynmawr; Beaufort; Braintree; Hartlepool (eight); Rishton; Cowling; Keighley (four); West Hartlepool (two); Holbeach; London; Wellington; Kelvedon; Jedburgh; Bovey Tracey; Denton (five); Rugby; Folkeston; West Ham; Birmingham; Haggerston; New Winchester; Mexborough; Doncaster (five); Bristol (five); Holsworthy (two); Ham Street; Shefford; Newbury; Chillaton; Okehampton; Yelverton; Whitchurch; Lydford; Tavistock (four); Mill Hill; Bury; Broad Park; Zoar; Burtle; High bridge; Weston-super-Mare; and Liverpool; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL AND SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Putford; Black Torrington; and Sheepwash; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Leith; Kirriemuir; and Cumnock; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Leith (two); Bowling; Cardross; Row; Helensburgh; Clydebank; Hamilton; Banff; Oban; Monikie; Rattray; Glasgow; Maybole; Greenock; Kinellar; and Fintray; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Leicester; Heath Town; Liverpool; Birkenhead; Newport (Monmouthshire) (two); Netherfield; Quarrington Hill; Saltford; Tedburn St. Mary; Okehampton (two); Cheadle; Rhydfelen; Treforest; Stone Allerton; Weare; Hackney; Page Bank; Havant; Weston-super-Mare (two); Eastleigh; Pentre Broughton; Rhosymedre; Sheffield (two); Peasedown; Keynsham; Bontuchel; Kendal; Clifton; Mount Sorrell; Bowling; Whittington Moor; Trelowth; Great Torrington; Peters Marland; Yarnscombe; Bradford; Langtree; Shebbear; Stebb Cross; Sandford; Ashton; Glasgow; Nottingham; Hartlepool; Oakworth; Bogthorn; Keighley (three); Aberystwyth; Caistor; Brecon; Brynmaur; Beaufort; Saracen's Head; Woodbrige; Ayr; Perth (two); Rugby; Worcester; Hightown; Lichfield; Bovey Tracey; Saltburn-by-the-Sea; Radstock; Hyde; Coate; Doncaster (two); Hockley; Risca; Mexborough; Silvertown; Croydon (three); Highworth; Bristol (three); Bramley; Exmouth; Shrewsbury; Manchester; Oxford; Beenham; Shefford; Bagshot; Lambourne; Stroud Green; Tavistock; Leeds; New Wortley (three); Holsworthy; South Marston; and Highbridge; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Llanwnda; Rhydfelen; Treforest; Brecon; and Aberystwyth; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

Accounts presented, showing the Interest accrued in respect of the Securities standing in the names of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to the credit of the Post Office Savings Banks Fund for the year ended 31st December, 1899, and of the Fund for the Banks for Savings and the Fund for Friendly Societies for the year ended 20th November, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 238.]

EXPLOSIVES.

Copy presented, of Twenty-fourth Annual Report of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Explosives, being for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Water Orders Confirmation Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 239.]

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) EXTENSION BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

*MR. H. S. FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I desire to make a few observations on the changes the Bill has undergone since it was first introduced to the House. The Bill was described last week by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire as one of the most important, if not the most important, Bill of the session. I do not know whether it quite deserves that description, but certainly the boon which this Bill will confer on the agricultural labourer will, I am sure, be largely appreciated throughout the country. I was not able to be in my place to move the Second Reading of the Bill, and my hon. friend behind me, who, ever since the introduction of the Workmen's Compensation Act, has shown a strong interest in this subject, was kind enough to undertake the motion on my behalf. I am sure it must be satisfactory to him, as it is to me, to find that the steps we took in 1897 in endeavouring to induce the Government to include the agricultural labourers within the scope of the Bill have borne fruit. In 1897 my hon. friend behind me and myself, at different stages of the Bill, moved amendments and divided the House for the purpose of introducing the agricultural labourers. At that time we were met by the Government with two or three classes of objections. One was that the Bill would impose a burden on the agricultural interest. Then it was stated that it had not been demanded by the agricultural labourers. I think the Secretary of State for the Colonies was responsible for that statement. Well, both of these statements have, I think, been disproved by what has subsequently taken place. With regard to the burden on agriculture some impressions are still felt that this Bill will impose a serious burden. I do not think it can be too widely known that there is no foundation whatever for that impression. because for a mere trifle—3s. or 3s. 6d. per £100 of wages per annum—employers of agricultural labourers will be able to get indemnity from responsible insurance offices for any liability which may be imposed on them under the Bill. No one will contend, in view of that fact, that this Bill will impose any serious burden on agriculture. With regard to the agricultural labourers not having demanded the Bill in 1897, I can certainly say, as representing a division of one of the eastern counties, that if they did not demand the Bill then they very much resented subsequently their exclusion from the Bill. I think that events in more than one Division of Norfolk amply prove that fact. I must consider myself fortunate in having got the assistance of the Government in support of this Bill, because without them it would have been impossible to carry the Bill through this session, and, more than that, I must express my indebtedness to the House, without whose assistance generally the Bill would not have occupied the place it does to-day. It was said on the Report stage by an hon. Member opposite that the Bill had been emasculated. I do not think anyone can fairly make that charge against the Bill as it stands to-day. The Bill has, I think, been greatly improved as compared with the necessarily skeleton form in which it was introduced and passed the Second Reading. It was necessary to impose some limitations, but no one has pointed out more clearly than the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean that these limitations were required if the Bill was to be really an effective working measure. The Government have lent their assistance in order that it should be a comprehensive measure, and to ensure that everyone who ought to be included in its scope is included. There was one suggestion made on the Report stage which was withdrawn, and which my hon. friend the Member for the Devizes Division tells me he does not intend to propose. I think he exercises a wise discretion in not proposing it. I mean the proposal to take this Bill out of the operation of a recent decision, in which it has been held that, under the Workmen's Compensation Act, unless a workman has been employed for at least two weeks, he is not within the provisions of the Bill. It is quite certain that it never was contemplated by the Government or the House he should be so excluded. It is certain that the decision has come as a surprise to those responsible for the Bill, and when an amending measure is proposed, and not only amending, but extending the benefits of compensation to all classes—a measure which cannot be long delayed—that mistake will be remedied, but I think it would be open to grave objection that a measure dealing only with one class, the agricultural labourers, should have an amendment of that kind. I trust that when this Bill goes to another place Her Majesty's Government will take as great an interest in it there, and ensure as much protection for it as in this House, so that the measure may be in no sense emasculated through fear as to the nature of its provisions towards agricultural labourers. I am sure those who desire to see the benefits of compensation not only extended to agricultural labourers, but to other trades, will regard this measure as the necessary precursor of that extension at no distant date.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): I join in support of the Third Reading of this Bill. I trust that the great hopes based upon it will be fully realised in its working. This is a measure which belongs to neither side of the House, nor to any party. Both sides of the House have been equal in their devotion and in the efforts they have made to secure the passing of this measure into law, just as many of us four years ago were interested in the passing of the Act of 1897. We then endeavoured to do for the agricultural labourer what we have now done, and we were only frustrated by influences which had great fear as to the disastrous consequences it might have on agriculture. As we are nearing the time when we shall have again to meet our supporters in the various constituencies, our fears have become considerably lessened, and our courage has risen to the occasion. I think we must all recognise the influence these events have had in ripening our judgment and our opinion on various subjects. One very important member of Her Majesty's Government has just arrived, and if I might, without presumption in one so feeble as myself, make a suggestion which would be of great value to the Government, it would be to occupy the early part of next session in an effort to secure the consolidation of the law relating to compensation for the labourer, and to make it inclusive and not exclusive. At the present moment we are engaged on a measure which, however good, it is no exaggeration to say is not inclusive, except of one industry, and even there I fear in the working of it many will be excluded whom we intended, when passing this Bill, should be included. The hon. Member for North Suffolk is fully alive to the fact that there is an enormous industry, one of the most deserving of Parliamentary protection and assistance, namely, our sailors and our fishermen, still excluded from this beneficent legislation. There is the greater part, nine-tenths probably, of the building trades still excluded from the Act of 1897, and I should strongly advise Her Majesty's Government to thoroughly put their house in order with regard to the question of compensation, and to bring in a consolidating Bill, making it apply to all sections of the community who have to work for their living, and who are liable to accident in the course of their employment. If Her Majesty's Government will undertake this work I am sure on this side of the House they will find an undivided desire to assist them at every stage of the Bill. If such a measure were carefully drafted—drafted I mean by experts and not amateurs, as some recent Acts are alleged to have been—there is no reason why the Bill should not be through the House in the course of ten days or a fortnight at the outside. I present this handsome suggestion to the Government, and I hope they will accept it. With regard to the measure now before us, I think we may say of the labourers—

> "We keep them at bay as long as we may,
> And then, when we must, we give them
> a crust."

I hope we shall take larger views of our duty, and that we shall soon see a complete enfranchising measure that leaves no meritorious case outside its scope, and, whoever may have the nominal honour of passing this Bill, we shall all rejoice in the accomplishment of the task, and all join hands most ardently in securing its complete triumph as an inclusive scheme. I have only one word more to say; I have said it before, but I think it will bear repetition. Before there is any complete settlement of this great scheme of compensation to the labourers for injuries, we shall have to consider a plan for some kind of contribution of the State towards the funds for this purpose, and for this reason. In many cases, as we all know, if a small employer was left to meet the whole burden of compensation in certain emergencies, it might mean absolute ruin, and I do not think any employer is entitled to have the whole of that burden cast upon his shoulders. All labour is for the State as well as for the individual, and we should all take a share in bearing the burden of those undertakings which are necessary to the maintenance of the nation and the empire. I do not think it is a thing we should do in a hurry. It is easy to conceive of cases where it is the duty of the community to share to some extent in the great calamities that do occasionally overtake some branches of our industrial system. I join heartily in the congratulations on the Third Reading of the Bill, and I only regret that the Bill is not wider in its scope. I have done what little service I could. [Laughter.] I do not see why the hon. Member for South-west Manchester should laugh. I have been engaged on this question thirty years, probably before the hon. Member for South-west Manchester ever heard of it. I have rendered whatever service I could to bring this Bill to its present stage by active co-operation, in order that it might become law this session.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I entirely agree with those who say that this is by far the most important Bill of this session, and that it is no party question. I somewhat regret that the hon. Member who has just sat down has endeavoured to make it a matter of party recrimination that the Bill was not passed earlier. I quite agree that the hon. Member has given us great assistance with the Bill. In the Grand Committee he took a keen interest in it, and I am glad to say that he and I were always on the same side. He suggests that all industries should contribute to a common fund to provide for all accidents. On the part of the agricultural interest I most entirely protest against that. Ours is a safe undertaking, and we can insure for a comparatively small sum, and I do not think we ought to provide insurance funds for accidents which occur in industries which are of a very dangerous character. They draw large profits from the work of the men, and they ought to provide for the risks incidental to that work. I rose for the purpose of dispelling, if possible, a misunderstanding which has been widely circulated in the country. Anyone who reads the comments which have appeared in the press on the discussion which took place on the Bill last Wednesday will see that the usually enlightened writers who follow our debates so diligently are entirely mistaken in one particular, and when there is a mistake in the press it is of the utmost importance that it should be corrected, because people do not read Acts of Parliament for themselves. The presumption of the law that everybody knows the law is a vainglorious presumption, and is not founded on fact. If people read the Act, the misunderstanding to which I am going to allude would not arise, but if they take their opinions from the press they will be under a misapprehension. Nearly everybody takes his opinions from the press, or from speakers who take their opinions from the press. The misunderstanding to which I refer is this. It has been widely circulated that there are words in this Bill which exclude from the advantage of it all agricultural labourers who are not habitually employed in agriculture. It has been said in many papers that we have excluded all those who are only casually employed in agriculture. That of course is not the case. The limitation is not one to keep out workmen, but to protect certain very poor employers. I think the Bill might have been more simply expressed if it had said in the first clause that it is to apply to every agricultural labourer, and then in the second clause that that should not be the case if an accident happened when working for an employer who does not habitually employ one or more workmen. If that had been so, no such misunderstanding could have arisen. My hon. friend has said that there must be some limitation, and I entirely agree with him, for this reason. The new liability which we are putting on farmers is for accidents for which they are not themselves responsible. If they are responsible for the accident, they are now called on to pay compensation under the law as it stands, but we are putting on them responsibility for accidents for which neither they nor the workmen are responsible, and which could not have been prevented by either of them. The only logical justification for that is one of two presumptions—either that the employer is better off than the workman, or that he is a man of business, and having an interest in the lives of his workmen, can insure them wholesale better than could be done retail. In the case of the very small men who do not habitually employ one or more employees, they are not men of business, and they have no great wages bill—a regular wages bill which reminds an employer of his duty of insuring himself against accidents—so that in the case of the small men both of these presumptions are entirely unfounded. The hon. Member spoke of forming a trust. We must be very careful how we deal out other people's bread. In the case of the small man it would be ridiculous to take away his bread and give it to others. One of these employers might, while working with his labourer, be injured as well as the workman. They might be both thrown out of a cart and seriously injured, and would it be right to add to the sufferings of the employer by taking away all that belongs to him and giving it to the workman? I am, certainly, not very well satisfied with the limitation as it stands, but fortunately there is another opportunity for reconsidering this Bill in a place where those present thoroughly understand the question of agriculture, and I rather gathered from the President of the Board of Agriculture that the words of limitation will be still further considered in that place.

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I think the thanks of the House are due to my hon. friend for his perseverance in this matter, for I believe the Bill is one which the House and the country will generally approve, and I feel a doubt as to whether I ought not to refer in the plural, rather than in the singular, to the authorship of this measure, as some friendly controversy appears to have arisen thereupon. If, however, my hon. friends near me are entitled to share the credit, I am bound to say that from the energetic manner in which the Member for Lowestoft came to the rescue when the Member for Cricklade threatened its existence by overloading upon the Report stage, it scarcely needed a Solomon to discover the true parent of the Bill. There is one thing I should like to take this opportunity of pointing out, and that is that a vast deal of misconception and strong public feeling in respect to a similar measure, of which this is more or less the outcome, was due to the fact that when that measure was presented to Parliament and the country there was no scheme of insurance submitted in connection with it, and no precautions taken to afford essential information under that important heading. The hon. Member for Leicester, and others, spoke of insurance in connection with this matter. The Workmen's Compensation Act of a previous session was hurried through Parliament without any proper scheme being prepared, and I trust the experience gained with regard to the dangers which arose from that course will be borne in mind. I hope that experience will lead the Government seriously to consider the question of insurance. I think that those employers who are affected by this Bill are deserving of some guidance if there is not actual participation on the part of the State. I could suggest a source whence the necessary funds might be derived, which I daresay in this connection would not be altogether unwelcome to the agricultural interest, for I say that any State assistance given to objects of this kind, in which I include old age pensions as well as funds for meeting cases of accidents, which fails to reach all classes of the community must necessarily partake of the perilous character of socialism. Therefore the fiscal provision which I have myself indicated is one under which every human being would be in the position of contributing towards the compensation. I trust my right hon. friend, the Home Secretary, will realise that some facilities should be afforded agriculturists—who are not, as a rule, very well up in commercial transactions—in getting information as to the direction in which they should look for assistance and co-operation. I do not wish my right hon. friend to give his imprimatur to any second edition of the Liberator Society, and to become the manager or director in his own person of any organisation for a purpose of this kind; but I think some assistance ought to be afforded to agriculturists in the remote districts to enable prudent persons to know how they can guard themselves from undue liability in connection with what is now becoming part of the law. Insurance has been denounced. We have been told that insurance lends itself to the encouragement of carelessness on the part of the employers, and that is an argument which was frequently used in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Act. The House and the country will not be disposed to lend countenance to that doctrine. I think it is universally recognised that prudent persons, especially those who from want of capital are not able to act as their own insurers, should be insurers in order to guard themselves. I hope that my right hon. friend will, at any rate before this Bill becomes law, see his way to afford some reliable information for guidance in the quarters to which I have referred. The question of exclusion of many occupations from the operation of this Bill has been spoken of. I own that I object to piecemeal legislation. I think to bring in a Bill dealing with one class of employment one session, and then to hurry through a Bill dealing with another class in another session, leaving out a large number of occupations, is scarcely a businesslike way of treating so important a subject, though I do not go the length of saying that all callings could be effectually included.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.): The hon. Member for Leicester said he did not know why I should laugh while he was speaking. I was amused when he was importing, or endeavouring to import, into the debate a portion of the credit for this measure to his own party. I know the interest the hon. Gentleman took in the passing of this measure. I notice that the late leader of the Liberal party, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, absolutely came down here on a Wednesday afternoon—a most unusual proceeding on his part—and asked us not to discuss this Bill at all. In fact I think I am right in saying that he asked my hon. friend in charge of the Bill to withdraw it altogether in order that some other Bill in which he was interested should be discussed. I also noticed that the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle wrote a letter to *The Times* in which he complained that a discussion had taken place on this Bill. It was a somewhat extraordinary proceeding on the part of the hon. Baronet, for he is well aware that we usually discuss Bills in the House. In fact I believe that is what the House is for. Seeing that it is wholly due to the efforts of my hon. friends around me and to the action of the Government that the Bill is likely to become law, the claim of the hon. Member for Leicester to an equal share of credit for his party cannot be allowed. As to the means of effecting insurance, the companies may be trusted to bring before employers their responsibilities; and as competition is very great, if one company does not offer satisfactory terms the employer can go elsewhere for his insurance. While I agree that consolidation is ultimately desirable, I think the time has not come for it. There are many points which have arisen under the 1897 Act of very great difficulty. I think it is generally admitted that it never was intended by Parliament that a man injured in an employment which he had only been in a day or a week should be put on a different footing to the man who had been in employment more than a week. I regret that that condition should still remain, and if an alteration of the law is made it should be done by an amending Act. It will be better to wait until the Bill has been extended to all trades, or as far as it is intended to go, before an amendment is made on the original Act. The hon. Member for Thirsk referred to the word "habitual," which has already given rise to some misconstruction. I think the word will lead to much legal difficulty in the construction. It is bound to give rise to a large amount of litigation, until at all events it has been decided by the Courts exactly what the word does mean.

*MR. GEDGE (Walsall): As Member for a large industrial town not directly affected by this Bill, I have not thought it necessary to take any active part in the framing of the measure. I merely rise now to congratulate the hon. Members who have been instrumental in passing the Bill, and I am very glad indeed that it is likely to go through this House without any further opposition. At the same time it seems to me that it was perfectly right not to have included agricultural labourers in the Act of 1897. We were then for the first time introducing into the law of this country the new principle that a man should be compensated for any injury he sustained, by his employer who had no part in failing to prevent or in bringing about the accident, which accident also was incidental to the employment in which he was engaged, and which might be supposed to be taken into consideration in fixing the remuneration for that employment. When we introduced that new principle it seems to me that it was perfectly right to limit it to trades and employments in which there was special danger, and then, after two or three years experience had shown that the Act was really beneficial to the employee and that the adoption of a system of insurance had prevented the terrible danger to employers which was anticipated, to extend it by degrees to other employments. I am very glad that the agricultural labourer is now to be brought within the scope of the Act; but when it is stated by my hon. friend the Member for Thirsk that the Bill is based on two principles, that the employer is to be made liable for injury to his workmen, first, because he is better off than they are; and secondly, because he is a better business man; I cannot really assent to any propositions of that kind. I should like to test them by putting them in a negative way. Suppose the Bill said that every employer should be liable for compensation for an injury sustained by any of his workmen while in his employment, provided only that the employer should be better off than the employee, or was a better man of business; just conceive any Judge attempting to decide questions of that kind. It is altogether a wrong principle that the private circumstances of a plaintiff or defendant should be taken into account, because they can have nothing to do with the merits of the case. It seems to me an absolutely absurd principle, and it would be impossible to determine liability by any such rule. There is a principle at the bottom of this Bill much better than these unsound propositions. It is that when there is injury from an accident in any manufacture the cost of compensation in such cases shall be considered as part of the cost of making the goods, and, therefore, though the compensation is paid in the first instance by the employer, it is ultimately paid by the purchaser of the goods. That was the only principle upon which I was able to support the Act of 1897, and it seems to me to be the only sound principle in legislation of this kind. In the first instance, of course, the employer must pay the compensation, and then he adds that expense to his rent, rates, and other expenses, and fixes the price of his goods accordingly. That is also the principle on which the Act must be extended to other trades. The system of insurance has now become universal, and the risks are found to be much less than were expected. Even in factories where dangerous machinery is employed the insurance rate, which was 30s. per £100 of wages, is now reduced to 6s., which shows that the fears which were entertained that the employers would be ruined have not in practice been justified. Then, with reference to consolidation, I hope we may not proceed with it for some little time. We have to see further how the Act of 1897 works, and also how this Bill will work, and we have to look with great care on all the decisions which have been given by the Law Courts. Workmen, I am sure, had occasion to say once again this morning when we opened our newspapers, "Thank God we have a House of Lords," which, not for the first time, yesterday performed a most important function with reference to the Act of 1897 by wiping away the cobwebs which had been placed on that enactment by the Court of Appeal. A County Court Judge had decided that when fair notice had been given within six months of an injury it was sufficient. The Court of Appeal by two to one, Lord Justice Romer dissenting, overruled that decision on a technical point that the notice ought to have been a formal notice, but the House of Lords yesterday swept that decision away and upheld the decision of the County Court Judge. There are several cases in which the parties have not gone to the House of Lords, and in which the Court of Appeal has inflicted on claimants some of these legal cobwebs. I hope, when the time for consolidation comes, all these decisions will be carefully studied, and I hope where defects have been shown in the Act they will all be swept away. I only wish to add, as a Member for an industrial town, I did not think it necessary to take part in the discussions on this Bill; at the same time I do not know any persons who are more anxious that this Bill should pass than artisans in industrial towns. That is certainly the case in Walsall, which I have the honour to represent. I heartily support the Third Reading of the Bill.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN (Suffolk, Woodbridge): I have a very great interest in this Bill, and there are one or two matters I should like to refer to before it is read a third time. I quite agree with the hon. Gentleman opposite who said that this is not a party question, and I agree also that in a desire to pass this Bill into law, there has been nothing to choose between the two sides of the House, so far as my observation went. Nothing has been said or done on either side of the House to obstruct this measure in any way. Still, I notice that the Bill has been used for political purposes and a certain amount of political capital has been made out of it. We on this side of the House have been told that we opposed this measure in 1897, and are in favour of it now, because the General Election is nearer now than it was then. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth in so many words made the same observation on the Second Reading of the Bill. Many hon. Members, like myself, voted against the agricultural labourers being included in the Bill of 1897, and now we not only vote for that inclusion, but have worked for it in every way we could. I maintain that these two attitudes are absolutely consistent. What we said in 1897 was exactly what we say now. We have not varied our position in any single degree. What we said in 1897 was that we were introducing a very novel principle which might inflict considerable hardship on employers; that we did not know what the liability would be, or what the rate of insurance would be; and that, although the large employer did not much matter, it might inflict great hardship on the small employer who was no better off than the labourer. I made inquiries in 1897, and was told that the premium for insurance was £1, then it came down to 10s., then to 5s., next to 3s. 6d., and now it is 3s. Is not that worth waiting for? We have protected the small employer, and our interest is not only for the agricultural labourer, but also for the small employer who will come under this Act if it passes. We have the interests of both classes to consider. The very best class of labourer is the man who succeeds in saving money and getting a little holding for himself. Many farmers in the east of England trace themselves back two generations to agricultural labourers, and these are the men to be encouraged and protected. If a man like that who has one labourer in his employment has to pay £1 or 3s. as insurance is it not a matter of great importance to him? When the Bill of 1897 was under discussion we said that it was impossible to apply it to all employers, and that we should wait for two or three years and then extend it. That is exactly what happened, and there has been no inconsistency whatever in our attitude. There is one matter in regard to the small employer which has not been sufficiently considered, that is with reference to the insurance rates. The minimum insurance rate quoted under this Act now is 5s. That means that a large employer who has a wages bill of over £150 will be able to insure at 3s. per cent., whereas the small employer whose wages bill is only £40 or £50 will have to pay 5s., *i.e.*, at the rate of 15s. per cent. It is therefore very important that some means should be devised to enable small employers to insure themselves by some method of combination or through their landlord. I think it would be an excellent plan if it were possible that the insurance should in the first instance be paid by the landlord. It is not the case that the landlord in, many instances can, as has been stated bear the burden of insurance himself, but what he can do to the great advantage of all concerned is to take out a policy for his estate and be repaid by the farmers when they pay their rents. In that way the small tenants will be able to insure at a smaller cost. If not through the landlord, he may be able to secure the same advantage through some agricultural association. I do not think it yet appears to be thoroughly understood what was stated so clearly by my hon. friend the Member for Thirsk with reference to the limitation in the measure. An hon. Gentleman just now seemed to repeat the error into which many hon. Members have fallen. He appeared to think that in a case of accident, compensation could not be paid to the injured man unless he had been habitually employed by his employer. That is not the proposal, and it cannot be made too clear what the Bill states. It is not a question as to whether the injured man was or was not an habitual employee, but whether the particular employer who is to be rendered liable had or had not in habitual employment at least one man. The injured man may have been working only for two or three weeks, but whether he had been working for a week or a month does not affect the question if he had been working for an employer who habitually employed at least one labourer, otherwise no liability would attach. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet said that he objected to this legislation because it was piecemeal. I can only say that I believe that the great merit of our legislation in this country is that it is piecemeal. I constantly hear the argument used that some measure is objectionable because it does not deal with the whole subject; but is there any hon. Member in this House who would be able to deal comprehensively and completely with the whole subject of workmen's compensation? We all know that is impossible. We know it is only by putting one small measure on another that we can proceed. In this matter we have not only to see that the agricultural labourer is benefited, but also that the small employer does not suffer; and I believe that we have, as far as possible, safeguarded the interests of both classes, and that the Bill will result in great advantage to the agricultural labourers. I know from personal experience that this measure is welcomed by the farmers themselves quite as much as by the agricultural labourers. The farmers not only do not oppose it, but a large number of them have actually insured their men beforehand. A case came within my personal notice where a man was killed by being run over by a wagon, and when I made inquiries I found that the farmer had insured the man under the terms of the Act, and that the widow received £75 compensation. The farmers are ready to give the Act a good reception, and I hope it will prove of benefit to the labourers, and be an additional bond of union between the two classes.

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): The hon. Member for the Woodbridge Division appeared to imply that I said that the landlords were well able to bear the insurance under this Bill. I said nothing of the kind, and I am sure the hon. Gentleman did not wish to misrepresent me.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN: I assumed, as the hon. Gentleman wished to put the burden on the landlords, that he considered that they were able to bear it.

MR. STRACHEY: The hon. Member implied that the landlords are badly off, and that therefore it would be unfair to put the burden on them; but it would be still more unfair to put it on the unfortunate farmers, who are still worse off, because if the landlord is badly off his tenants must be worse off. Then, again, the hon. Gentleman rather gave the case away when he said that the small farmers could combine among themselves voluntarily; but, if voluntarily, why not compulsorily, and then the labourer would be be certain to get compensation. If the word "habitually" had been struck out of this Bill, as we attempted to strike it out in the interest of a very large class of agricultural labourers, then the small farmers would combine as a matter of course. I think the hon. Gentleman did not make his case at all strong. He admits that every farmer should insure his men, and yet he seems to object that that insurance should be compulsory, except in the case of large farmers. I think the hon. Gentleman gave the whole case away.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): This is not the time for opening old controversies. On all sides of the House it is honestly and really believed that considerable benefit will accrue to the class concerned by the passage of this Bill. At the same time I think there is no reason why we should not acknowledge that there are elements of danger connected with it in certain cases, and it is because I realise that danger strongly that I rise to make a suggestion in the direction of mitigating it. Where I see the possibility of danger is in connection with the class of smaller employers of labour who live in out-of-the-way districts, and are not brought into contact with town life and who do not know what is going on. They may neglect altogether to take the precautions necessary under this Bill, and they may find themselves as the result of an unfortunate accident liable for heavy compensation. That is a danger which is not only possible, but probable. We know very well how reluctant certain classes of farmers are to take any new steps, and they will be apt to let the thing slide and not make any move in the direction of insurance until the necessity of doing so is brought home to them by experience. I think something should be done to give a warning to these classes in time, and to put before them the danger they run in neglecting to take precautions under the Bill.

Mr. H. S. FOSTER: The President of the Board of Agriculture has already stated that in the event of this Bill becoming law the Board will not only issue circulars, but also circulate information throughout the country calling attention to the provisions of the new Act.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY: I was not aware that that undertaking had been given; but that was the suggestion I intended to make to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture. We all desire to see that promise fulfilled, but I am perfectly certain that it will be necessary not only that the information should be disseminated as widely as possible, but that some suggestion should be given to farmers as to where they may get the assistance they require. I suggest information should be distributed through the local chamber of agriculture in each district. It is certainly very desirable that whatever information they get should be correct and genuine, and not spurious and haphazard, and I hope this information which the Board of Agriculture have undertaken to spread will be disseminated in every direction, and that it will reach all those out-of-the-way places which are particularly affected. If this is done we shall be relieved of some sad and distressing cases where this measure is intended to do good. I shall be quite satisfied if this extra expression of opinion from the House insures the dissemination of this knowledge among the class to whom I have alluded.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) said this Act applied to a very poorly paid class of persons. Agriculture was much subject to foreign competition, but at the same time it must be remembered that accidents were very few amongst those employed in agriculture, and consequently tne rate of insurance would be only a trifle. As one who three years ago voted not only for the inclusion of those employed in agriculture, but also for the inclusion of all trades whatever, under the Workmen's Compensation Act, he rejoiced to know that this step had been taken, and he regretted that the Government had not seen fit to bring in a measure which would have done a vast amount of good in the country to remedy the law in other respects so as to prevent a vast amount of the litigation which still went on under the Act. He hoped that the Government would, at the first opportunity, bring in a compensation measure which would include all the trades in the country.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIABILITY OF SHIPOWNERS AND OTHERS) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), further considered.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanark, Mid): On behalf of my hon. friend the Member for Dundee, I beg to move the Amendment which stands in his name, to leave out the words "Without their actual fault or privity." The object of this Amendmend is to secure that the present liability as regards the dock authorities shall not be altered by the addition of these words. I quite understand that these words have been put in in the case of the dock authorities so as to correspond with the same words in the Merchant Shipping Act as applied to the shipowner, and the object is to preserve the law of liability in regard to dock authorities exactly as it is at the present moment. I move this amendment formally, but if the promoters are ready to accept the Amendment to be moved later on by my hon. friend the Member for Cork my objection to these words will be met. In the meantime I beg to move this Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 15, to leave out the words 'without their actual fault or privity.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said these particular words were necessary in order to establish the reciprocity between the shipowner and the dockowner which was contemplated by the Bill. If the dockowner was aware that the harbour was in a defective state, and he did not remedy it, it was only reasonable that the common law of liability should be fully extended to him. He was glad to hear that the hon. Member did not intend to press his Amendment. In regard to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, although they did not think it was altogether necessary, they were willing to accept it.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) said he thought there was more to be said in favour of this Amendment than had been stated by the hon. Member for Mid Lanark. When the Merchant Shipping Acts first embodied these words there was a very large ownership of ships either by individuals or by associations of individuals who were not registered as companies. That distinction existed in the case of docks, for some of them were owned by private individuals and some by public authorities. In the case of harbour boards, which were public authorities, the members of them had no personal interest in the concerns they managed. Those bodies must always act by their officers. The distinction which the clause would endeavour to set up between damage from negligence within the "fault or privity" of a dock authority and the result of negligence not within their privity was an entirely futile distinction, because a harbour or dock authority always acted through the advice of their harbour master, engineer, or other officer, and therefore any negligence would by law be imputed to the authority. He did not think that there was any real reciprocity between dock owners and shipowners established by this clause. The shipowner would practically always escape, because, in 999 cases out of 1,000, he would not be managing his own ship; but the dock authorities would always be liable, because they can only act through their officers, and the law would hold that the act of their officers was within their actual fault or privity, and they would be made liable. He should like to hear the views of the Solicitor General on the subject.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University): I certainly think that the words as they stand in the clause are absolutely necessary. The clause proposes to limit the liability of dock-owners and harbour commissioners as it is limited in the case of shipowners. It does not propose that where an accident occurs through actual fault or privity on the part of the dock-owners or harbour commissioners they should be released from paying the penalties. That is exactly the same way as the law stands in regard to shipowners. The hon. and learned Member for Cork seems to think that the circumstances are such that the protection will be removed in all cases, but I think I can suggest to him an example where the Act, as it stands at present, would apply. Take, for instance, the case of a harbour board or dock company who have had before them a report from their officers of something faulty in the construction or arrangement of their docks. That would be held to be a matter in which the harbour board or the dock-owners had been informed, and if damage was done in consequence of this fault it would be held to be a case "within the actual fault or privity" of the authorities. In a case where a fault was brought to their notice, and they took no notice of it, they ought to be made liable. It is extremely essential that the words should stand as they are. I think there was a question as to whether it might be argued—though I do not think it could be argued successfully—that this clause creates a new liability, but that will be met by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, which the promoters of this Bill will accept, and then the law as to the liability of dock and shipowners will be in the same position.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said the words in the clause had given rise to an apprehension that there would be an extension of liability, but he believed that the main thing was a fear that a new liability would be created. He gathered that those who were in charge of the Bill were willing to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork upon this point, and he was therefore inclined to take the responsibility of advising the hon. Member for Mid Lanark not to press this Amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL: I beg to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: The hon. Member in charge of the Bill has spoken of the necessity of establishing reciprocity between the dock owner and the shipowner. In order to bring about that reciprocity I think the hon. Member will see that the Amendment I now move is absolutely necessary. As it stands this Bill is practically a Liverpool Bill.

*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: No, no!

MR. MAURICE HEALY: The hon. Member interrupts me because he does not know the sense in which I use that phrase. I do not mean it in the sense that Liverpool only will be protected, because I know that there are a great many large harbours besides Liverpool to which it will extend protection. I simply use the phrase as distinguishing harbours like Liverpool from harbours of a much smaller size, which will get no sort of protection from Clause 2. I quite agree that, in the case of harbours like Liverpool and Belfast, this clause will give ample protection, but the authorities at Cork Harbour will get no sort of protection from this clause. In these large ports the limitation which is proposed of £8 per ton on the tonnage of the largest ship entering the port is a very valuable provision. But let us take the case of a small port like Cork. In Cork harbour we have sometimes some very large ships, and even the steamship "Oceanic" goes there, but such vessels only enter Cork harbour for the purpose of taking up mails and passengers. They do not ship cargo and make use of the harbour in the same sense as those vessels use the Liverpool harbour. If a vessel of that kind is injured what possible protection is it to Cork harbour to say you shall not be liable for injuries of that kind beyond £8 a ton? I understand that the case of Cork is parallel with the case of a great many small harbours in the United Kingdom. I think that establishes my point. If in the Liverpool docks an accident happens, or one of the sluice gates on the Manchester Ship Canal goes wrong, and a number of small vessels are injured in consequence, the dock or canal authorities will only be liable for damage at £8 per ton. In Cork harbour, however, we should be liable for the full amount of the actual injury incurred, and therefore this clause is absolutely no protection for Cork harbour. The hon. Gentleman opposite has spoken of reciprocity, and I invite him by this Amendment to give us reciprocity. The shipowner is only liable for £8 a ton in respect of the ship doing the injury, and we should be liable to the extent of £8 per ton for the ships injured. In the case of small harbours like Cork and Dundee this is substantially no limitation whatever, and the state of things if this Bill passes will be that the shipowner is to be protected in this difficulty, and will only be liable for £8 per ton on the tonnage of the ship doing the injury, although the injury done may be enormously in excess of that amount, but if the dock authority is unfortunate enough to injure a number of small vessels, that authority will be liable for the full amount of the damage, and will not have any reference to the tonnage of the largest ship entering the port. My Amendment would give protection here, because it would make the limit of the liability the same in both cases.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out from the words 'tonnage of,' to the word 'power,' in line 24, inclusive, and insert the words 'such vessel or vessels,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Maurice Healy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words from the words 'tonnage of,' to the word 'trading,' in line 22, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: In reply to the hon. and learned Member opposite as to whether this clause does establish that reciprocity between shipowners and dock-owners which we aim at, I would remind him that in case a shipowner becomes liable for damages in respect of a number of vessels, his liability is limited to £8 per ton upon the tonnage of his own vessel in respect of the aggregate damages to all the other vessels. Where the dock-owner, through whose negligence a number of ships are damaged, is liable the same principle should apply, and the only question is as to what the amount of the liability shall be. The hon. Member has contended that a dock should be treated in the same way as a single ship; but that is impossible, because a dock or harbour is intended to accommodate a large number of ships, and therefore it would not be possible to treat a dock as a single ship. The question as to what would be a fair basis of liability between shipowners and dock-owners has been very carefully considered, and after a discussion between the shipowners and the dock-owners it was agreed that the maximum liability of dock-owners or harbour authorities with respect to shipping should be measured by a sum equal to £8 per ton for the largest ship which has entered the dock or harbour during the five years previous. We considered that to be a fair measure of liability on the part of the dock or harbour authorities in relation to shipping. They would then be protected in case a mishap occurs on a large scale by which a large number of vessels are damaged, for then the dock-owner would only be liable to the extent of £8 a ton in respect of the aggregate damages. What shipowners require is to have a full indemnity in individual cases. If an accident occurs through some act of negligence they want to be able to recover in full, and in nine cases out of ten this clause enables that to be done. Take as an instance a ship of 1,000 tons. Suppose she is wrecked with her cargo, owing to the neglect of the dock authority. That ship with her cargo may be worth £30,000, but the amount recoverable under the Amendment of the hon. Member would only be about £8,000. With reference to what the hon. Member for Cork has said about this being a Liverpool Bill, that is not the case, as the Bill is the result of an agreement arrived at between the shipping associations and the principal dock and harbour authorities throughout the United Kingdom.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: I did not intend it as a term of reproach.

*Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR: I agree that all ports are not equally benefited by this Bill, but it is impossible that there can be any general rule which will work out the same in every case. All ports do benefit, but not to the same extent. In the case of Cork harbour, if a large steamer is lost through the negligence of the Cork harbour authorities this Bill places a limit to their liability. It is not possible to have a general rule which will work out the same in every case.

Mr. CALDWELL said he failed to see any reciprocity whatever in the clause as it now stood. The liability of shipowners was limited to £8 per ton in the event of their vessels damaging the docks—he meant £8 per ton on the tonnage of the vessel causing the mischief. But if, on the other hand, the dock authority caused damage to a vessel, its liability was not by any means limited to £8 per ton on the tonnage of that vessel, and in the case, say, of a vessel of 1,000 tons burthen the liability would not be limited to £8,000; it would be based on the tonnage not of the vessel injured, but of the largest vessel entering the dock during the preceding five years. Where, then, did the reciprocity come in? The tonnage of the vessels entering some ports might be comparatively small; but then, as the value of the cargo was included, a vessel of 1,000 tons register might easily prove to be worth £20,000 or £30,000, and if that ship and its cargo were sunk the responsibility of the dock authorities might practically go to the extent of £24,000, because on some previous occasion a vessel of 3,000 tons register had happened to call at that particular port. That showed the difficulty of treating a dock company on the same lines as a ship. The limit of £8 per ton was agreed to in the case of a ship because it was realised that a vessel was engaged in a more or less hazardous enterprise, and had to run risks which were unavoidable. But the case of a dock authority was very different. It had no difficulties of navigation to deal with, and, to his mind, there was no reason why there should be any limit at all. The fact was, a bargain appeared to have been struck between the dock authorities on the one hand and the shipowners on the other. They had come to an agreement to limit their respective liabilities, and now this Bill was being forced through the House of Commons on a Wednesday afternoon, when there was nobody present interested in it except the dock authorities and the shipowners. He had a strong objection to Bills going through the House in that way. He thought it would be better to delete this clause altogether. There could not be said to be reciprocity when the shipowner's liability was limited to £8 per ton in the event of his vessel damaging the dock, while the dock authority's liability, on the other hand, extended to £8 per ton not merely on the vessel damaged, but on the largest vessel that happened to have entered the dock during the preceding five years.

*Mr. WARR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): This Amendment is pressed in the interest of the dock-owners. It is very much easier to argue that a shipowner is entitled to a limit of liability than it is that a dock-owner should have any such limit granted him. I remember that in the debate on the Second Reading on this Bill the hon. and learned Attorney General said the subject of limiting the liability of shipowners was well worth discussion, and he did not think there was any real answer to their claim to such a limit. The problem now is to give the dock-owners also a limit, and it seems to me that the terms in which the Amendment has been moved and supported by hon. Members show that there is a singular confusion of ideas with regard to the limit of liability. That limit is fixed upon the assumed value of the thing which does the injury, not of the thing to which the injury is done. If it is a ship that causes the injury its liability is fixed at £8 per ton, that being for that purpose assumed to be the value of the ship, but should it be the dock which is responsible for the mischief to the ship then the problem arises, what should be the limit of liability of the dock authority? You have to find, if you apply the same principle, not the value of the ship or ships injured by the neglect of the dock authorities, but some value which can be assumed to be the value of the dock for the purpose of assessing the dock-owner's liability. At the present moment the dock-owner has unlimited liability. You cannot base the limit of the dock's liability upon the value of the vessel which the dock has injured. Shipowners are most anxious to arrive at some limit of liability on the part of the dock-owner, and they have therefore agreed that the assumed value of the dock shall be based upon the tonnage of the largest ship entering during the preceding five years. I admit that that is not logical, but then it is impossible to put the matter on any logical basis. We must, however, have some basis for the valuation of the dock, and, if this is not a very favourable arrangement for the dock authorities, I am very greatly mistaken. The provision is one from which the dock authorities have everything to gain and nothing to lose. I hope, therefore, the House will see fit to accept the limit proposed by the clause as it stands, as it embodies a compromise made between the different interests who alone will be affected.

*MR. PROVAND (Glasgow, Blackfriars) agreed with the last speaker that this provision of the Bill was in the nature of a compromise and had no logical basis. Undoubtedly the value of a dock was enormously greater than that of a ship. Take the case of the Liverpool Docks. He believed their capital value stood in the company's books at eighteen millions sterling, and a vessel damaged in entering them would probably not be worth a thirtieth or fortieth part of that sum. That showed the enormous difference between the value of a dock and the value of a vessel; and, although the compromise which had been arrived at would no doubt act unequally, it was impossible to have any scheme of arriving at a valuation which would not also have unequal operation. Still he contended that the compromise to which his hon. and learned friend objected was better than the position in which the dock authorities stood at the present moment, of having an unlimited liability. If his hon. and learned friend could suggest any other method which would be fair all round, the House, no doubt, would gladly consider it; but, as he believed the clause as it now stood would be a welcome relief to both shipowners and dock authorities, he hoped that the Amendment would be withdrawn.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.) said that, speaking on behalf of the Manchester Ship Canal Company, he wished to point out that they had a deep interest in this matter. The opposition to this clause came from Queenstown. He was quite prepared to admit that his hon. and learned friend was justified in standing up for the interests of that port. But he thought he might fairly appeal to him to consider that there were not other interests which required safeguarding. So far as Manchester was concerned he had no authority to say that the carrying of the Amendment would wreck the Bill, but he would assert most distinctly that Manchester would withdraw its support from the Bill, and that, he thought, was a matter worthy of very serious consideration. He would ask the hon. and learned Member to consider if the Bill, after all, was not more in the interests of Queenstown than the law as it at present stood. He hoped that, having regard to the interests of the Manchester Ship

Canal, the hon. and learned Member would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said there was undoubtedly a great difference between England and Ireland with regard to port and harbour authorities, and there was a strong feeling in a number of Irish ports that the shipowners in the House, who constituted a very powerful interest —more powerful, indeed, than the railway interest, because they worked more unitedly—had been able to prevent the Irish port authorities having so good a show as they were entitled to. The English port authorities, in his opinion, had, in coming to an agreement on this Bill, entirely omitted to take cognisance of the poorer ports in Ireland. No doubt the Bill would be a great advantage to such places as Liverpool, but it should be remembered that the Irish ports were largely ports of call, and did not get the benefit from cargoes and passengers which the English ports reaped. He quite accepted the view of the last speaker that the Manchester Ship Canal Company deserved consideration. But the point was whether that consideration ought not to be given by means of a private Bill, in view of the exceptional position of that undertaking. Was it fair that they should be asked to legislate for the whole country on the basis of an exceptional undertaking like the Manchester Ship Canal, which had special difficulties in the shape of locks, etc.? He hoped they would have some statement of the views of the Government. The Solicitor General should remember that in this matter he represented both England and Ireland, and although it had been said that Dublin sanctioned this Bill, it was clear that Cork and Belfast were opposed to it.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: The points raised by the hon. and learned Member have been very fully considered by the Board of Trade and by the Government Departments concerned in the Bill. Certainly the proposal to which exception is taken is not a logical or an ideal proposal. The Board of Trade, however, have endeavoured to obtain as far as possible the views of the great shipowners and associations represented, and in the same way they have the opinion of the dock-owners that the proposal as to limitation is the only one they can agree upon, and it has been embodied in the Bill. As regarded harbours like Cork, with which I am somewhat familiar, and some harbours in this country, I fully concede that the proposal contained in the Bill does not give the same amount of relief as is given to larger harbours, but that is not saying that they get no relief. When we speak of reciprocity, we cannot give the same benefit in all cases. The Bill as it stands does deal in all cases with limitation, and if it is abandoned or not passed the advantage which would be conferred under limited liability will be lost. If the Bill is not passed there will be no limitation at all. Under the circumstances, as this is a matter mainly concerning ship-owners and dock-owners, it seems reasonable that they should put their heads together and try if some reasonable way cannot be found to bring about a limitation of liability. I hope the Amendment, therefore, will not be pressed.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.): I also trust that the hon. and learned Member opposite will not press this Amendment. I should like to remind him that in this Bill as originally introduced there was no protection whatever for the dock authority; in fact, the limitation of liability under it would have been against the dock-owning authorities. Under these circumstances I ventured, on the Second Reading, to oppose the Bill, and the promoters of it at once agreed to consider the question of reciprocity. This clause is the result of that consideration. We must all realise that the standard measure of limitation of liability is illogical. It is an imaginary standard, and to a great extent the hon. Member for Mid Lanark is quite right in saying that there is no absolute reciprocity. It was necessary, however, that some kind of compromise should be arrived at, and I believe that on the whole this clause represents the most satisfactory form. Cork harbour may not receive the same amount of protection as is given to other places, but undoubtedly this Bill will place it in a better position than it stands in under the present law. Under these circumstances I hope the hon. Gentleman opposite will see that every effort has been made to arrive at a fair arrangement, and I trust, therefore, he will not press his Amendment.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I quite agree with the hon. and learned Gentleman who has introduced this Amendment, but in the Standing Committee we discussed practically the same Amendment, with the result that we arrived at the best conclusion we could under the circumstances. I agree with the hon. and learned Gentleman that as things stand the liability is not accurately measured, but there were difficulties on both sides. The representatives of port and dock boards all over the country met and considered this question, and arrived at what they conceived to be the best possible solution. If we endeavour to raise fresh discussion now I am afraid the result will be that we will not get the Bill at all. I therefore appeal to the hon. and learned Gentleman to allow the Bill to stand as it is, because we have practically agreed as to what can be done under the circumstances.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: In deference to the appeal which has been made I will ask leave to withdraw this Amendment. I protest against the manner in which the Government have treated foreign countries as compared with the manner in which they have treated Ireland. In asking leave to withdraw the Amendment I beg to give notice that on a subsequent Amendment I will again raise the question of the unfair treatment meted out to the port of Cork under this Bill.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: This is not a Government Bill. It is a measure which has been brought forward by the shipowners and the dock-owners, and if an Amendment had been agreed to by both sides the Government would not depart from their attitude of agreement with what was acceptable to all parties concerned.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: On behalf of the hon. Member for Linlithgow I beg to move the Amendment standing in his name, which I may say has been agreed to by all the parties to this Bill. I will briefly state to the House the object of this Amendment. As the Bill was brought in the liability of the harbour or conservancy authority might extend to an amount not exceeding £8 per ton of the tonnage of the largest registered British ship which within a period of five years previous to the damage had been "within" the area over which the authority exercised any power. It was pointed out when the Bill came before the Standing Committee on Law that the word "within" might have the effect of admitting within the clause vessels which simply passed through the area of the port or entered it for shelter, and it was agreed, and I think correctly, that it would not be right that the maximum liability of the port should be fixed in relation to vessels which had entered it for a temporary purpose in the course of a voyage elsewhere. To meet that view the words "trading to or from" were suggested on the spur of the moment as indicating the description of vessel to which the clause would apply. After careful consideration it was found that these words were also open to objection. One objection was that they might not have the effect intended. because it might be argued that a vessel which passed through the area of a port was "trading to or from" that port and might consequently come within the clause. Let us take a concrete case. Suppose a vessel from Glasgow entered Greenock for shelter it might be held that that vessel was "trading to or from" the area of the latter port. Then again the word "trading" is a very ambiguous term and would exclude from the scope of the clause ships in graving docks, although it is intended that the Bill should apply to them. Suppose a ship in a graving dock were damaged, if these words were retained there would be no maximum liability at all, because the vessel could not be said to be "trading to or from" the port. After consideration it was considered better to restore the Bill to its original form, so as to include all vessels within the area of a port and then to add an Amendment taking out those vessels to which the clause was not intended to apply. I hope the Amendment will be accepted.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 22, to leave out the words 'trading to or from' in order to insert the word 'within.'"—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)

Question proposed "That the words 'trading to or from' stand part of the clause."

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Before this Amendment is accepted, I wish to be satisfied that it is not a further assault on the position of Cork Harbour. As the hon. Gentleman explained it, I do not think any exception can be taken to it, but when we consider the change in the wording it appears to me that it might give rise to very great difficulty. As I understand it, the effect of the Amendment is this. As the clause left the Standing Committee, the limit of liability was based on the largest vessel "trading to or from" the port. Under the Amendment now proposed the limit of liability is to be based on the tonnage of the largest vessel which has been "within" the port during the preceding five years, with certain qualifications pointed out in a further Amendment. I have in my mind the case of the ocean liners calling at Cork. They do not represent the normal shipping of the port at all; they simply call to pick up passengers and mails, but the bulk of their passengers and cargo are taken on at Liverpool. As this clause originally stood, I think it might fairly be argued that these vessels were not "trading to or from" the port of Cork, but if the Amendment now proposed is accepted, any vessel which has been within the area of the harbour, with the limitations mentioned in the next Amendment, would come within the scope of the clause. The hon. Member has very carefully protected the interests of his own port in the Amendment which he has introduced; perhaps, I ought not to say his own port, because I am not sufficiently acquainted with Leith, but at any rate the ports where shipbuilding is carried on and graving docks exist are very carefully protected by the Amendment of the hon. Member. I think I have proved that the Amendment would be a distinct assault on the interests of Cork harbour, which I represent, and I shall certainly oppose it unless I get some pledge from the promoters of the Bill to extend the qualifications set forth in the second Amendment by the addition of such words as "or that it has unloaded or loaded mails or passengers within that area." I think it is plain that injury will otherwise be inflicted on the port which I represent. The limit of the liability of the port should be its normal shipping, such as ships loading or unloading cargo, but as the Amendment stands large Atlantic liners which cannot in any way be said to trade to or from the port would be included.

MR. WARR: I am not at all sure that the words "trading to or from" which it is proposed to omit would not be held to include Atlantic liners calling at a port to land mails and passengers. The very effect of this Amendment is to protect the port of Cork from liability to the danger which the hon. and learned Member has spoken of. The object of the second Amendment is that the liability of the port shall be measured by the vessels which are really within the port, not by the vessels which call at it.

MR. CALDWELL: I do not think that the Amendment suggested, coupled with the Amendment that follows, really gives the port of Cork the relief which the hon. Member has just suggested. The words "trading to or from" might, no doubt, be held to include the "Oceanic," supposing it landed mails, and therefore that vessel might be held to be the measure of the liability of the port. The second Amendment only refers to vessels which have entered a port for safety or have only passed through, which is a very different thing from a vessel entering a harbour such as Cork to land passengers and mails. Such a vessel is not taking shelter, and it is doing something more than "passing through." This limitation might apply to wide areas, such as Glasgow or Leith, but it certainly would not help Cork in any way. There would, of course, be the chance of the words "trading to or from" being interpreted as the hon. Member suggests, but they are obviously open to a great deal of discussion.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS: I am quite sure nothing is further from the minds of the promoters of this Bill than to make any attack on Cork harbour. I think the hon. Member for Cork put his case a little too high. He said that the large ocean liners calling at the port of Cork are rather a nuisance than otherwise.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Oh, no; I never said that.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS: I consider that these ships confer a certain amount of advantage on Cork, and I would be sorry to see them withdrawn. I hope the hon. Member will put one thing against the other, and that when we release him from any idea of thinking that these liners are a nuisance he will release us of any idea of intending to make an attack on Cork.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Surely it is legitimate that we should put forward local points as they strike us. That is no justification for the hon. Member saying that we regard these ocean liners as a nuisance. We got them after a struggle of many years, and we have built at enormous cost facilities for them, but at the same time we do not want to be in the position in which Liverpool will be under this Bill. Ought Cork to be placed in the same position as Liverpool, which has all the advantage of the initiation of this Atlantic cargo and passenger trade, whereas only a score or two of passengers and a few bags of mails are put off at Queenstown? We are within our rights in pressing the case of Cork, and in taking steps to prevent the Cork Harbour authorities being onerated in the same way as the harbour authorities at Liverpool, Hull, and other great ports. We have put our case in a moderate form, and in view of our anxiety that some compromise should be arrived at, I think our action should not be treated almost as if it were an act of treason.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: I should like to suggest to the hon. and learned Member for Cork that the words proposed in the Amendment are really better than the words in the Bill from his point of view. The words in the Bill are "trading to or from," and he seemed to think that it was perfectly clear that the "Oceanic" or any other Atlantic liner calling at Cork harbour for the purpose of taking off passengers and mails would not be held to be trading to or from that port. I should be inclined to take the opposite view. It certainly would appear to me to be very difficult to draw distinction between a port where passengers and mails are embarked and the ultimate port of call. If that were held to be trading, then the words in the Bill would bring these Atlantic liners within its scope. Then as regards the words in the Amendment, "passed through such area on a voyage between two places," I do not in the least say that it is clear that they would include Atlantic liners under the circumstances mentioned, but I think they are quite as good as the words in the Bill. I have not made these observations in any hostility to Cork. For my own part, I should be very glad to see Cork having all possible advantages, but I do not think that anything would be gained by refusing to pass the Amendment.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The specific question is, I understand, whether, under the words now proposed to be inserted, the limit of liability in the case of Cork would apply to the Atlantic liners. Cork is no more protected by the words of the Amendment than it is by the words in the Bill. I would call the attention of the promoters of this Bill to the fact that at regards these words and other words to which exception has been taken, opposition and criticism have come from Scotch and Irish Members. The plain inference to be drawn from that is that the promoters of the Bill would be wise if they consented to insert a clause that the Act should not apply to Scotland or Ireland. If they assented to that, all opposition would be withdrawn.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I will not persist in my objection to the present Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: I now beg to move the second Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Linlithgow, up to and including the word "area" in the fifth line, and excluding the words "or that it has been fitted out, ballasted, or repaired within that area." The first part of the Amendment was that put down by the hon. Member for Linlithgow, and it was accepted on behalf of the shipping and docks representatives. The words which I have omitted appeared on the Paper for the first time this morning, and I have since received a communication from the hon. Member for Linlithgow, stating that he did not press for the inclusion of these words, and asking me to move the Amendment without them. The Amendment which I now beg to move excepts vessels which have only passed through the area or have put in for shelter. There appears to be no reason why an exception should be made in the case of vessels which have been fitted out, ballasted, or repaired within the area. They pay dues to the port, and there is no reason why the port authorities should repudiate their obligation in regard to them. A further reason is that if these vessels were excluded, in the event of an accident the amount which would be recoverable would be altogether out of proportion to the value of the vessel. Take the case of a large Cunard steamer that may be worth £300,000 or £400,000. The Bill as it stands proposes to reduce the maximum liability from that amount to £8 per ton on 14,000 tons, or £112,000. That is a very great concession. Shipowners will not assent to such vessels being further exempted, and the majority of the dock authorities do not wish them to be so exempted.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 24, after the word 'power' to insert the words 'A ship shall not be deemed to have been within the area over which a harbour authority or a conservancy authority performs any duty, or exercises any powers, by reason only that it has taken shelter within or passed through such area on a voyage between two places both situate outside that area.'"—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to move to add the following words, "or that it has loaded or unloaded mails or passengers within that area." I think I am justified in saying that as the Bill now stands it cuts against the port I represent and other small ports in Ireland. I began by describing this Bill as a Liverpool Bill. It is admitted that the Bill originated in the peculiar position of Liverpool, and in the special liabilities which have arisen in connection with the Manchester Ship Canal. I have not the smallest desire that that great commercial concern should not get from this House the treatment that it deserves, but I think it is unfair to deal with small ports on a basis specially suitable to the Manchester Ship Canal. It is only in the case of the Manchester Ship Canal that we can even imagine such serious accidents as are contemplated in this Bill. It would be quite impossible that they could occur in any ordinary dock. When, therefore, it is proposed to change the whole shipping law of the United Kingdom, it is unfair that no distinction is made between small ports in Ireland and ports such as Liverpool and Hull. My proposal is that the port of Cork should not be treated under this Bill as if it were the port of Liverpool. That is all I ask. The hon. Member opposite ventured to say that I referred to these ocean steamers calling at Cork as a nuisance. That is not our view. We are not so absurd. We are delighted that they call at the port, and we benefit from them in many directions, and I must proceed to argue my case on the basis that Cork does benefit by these steamers calling at the port. But can anyone say that the port of Cork benefits by these liners in the same way as Liverpool benefits? Such a statement would be absurd; and, accordingly, while these provisions may be perfectly fair to the port of Liverpool and to other large ports, they are not fair in the case of Cork, because the Atlantic liners do not use that port as they use Liverpool, and only confer upon Cork a fraction of the benefit they confer on Liverpool. I suggest that when we are devising this measure of liability, and are founding it upon the traffic of a port and the ships using that port, we should take as the measure the normal traffic of the port. In the case of Cork the liners do not even come alongside the quay, and very often do not come inside the harbour at all, in many cases taking passengers and mails from a tender outside the limits of the harbour. I thought it would be at least arguable that these liners were not trading to or from the port of Cork. I may be wrong, but I do not know whether it would be similarly arguable that, in the words of this Amendment, they are merely passing through on a voyage between New York and Liverpool. Perhaps that would be arguable also. We are now passing an Act which will settle the measure of the liability of Cork on the basis of these ocean liners, whereas it ought to be measured by the vessels using the port.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to add the words 'or that it has loaded or unloaded mails or passengers within that area.'"—(*Mr. Maurice Healy.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. PROVAND: I think it has been tried to be shown in this debate that the larger ports in England and Scotland are being treated in this Bill with exceptional favour as compared with smaller ports, and especially as compared with the port of Cork which my hon. friend represents. I think that is not taking a fair view of this Bill. The Bill is the best compromise that could be arrived at by those who considered it. The hon. and learned Member says that Cork should have separate treatment, because the Atlantic liners only call there, and on many occasions do not enter the port at all. I have passed the port of Queenstown some thirty or forty times. Coming East the steamers do not enter the port, but going West they usually, although not invariably, enter it. Then he says that the vessels do not go alongside a wharf, and only discharge mails and passengers, because there is no cargo to be shipped or discharged, but, if cargo offered, the case would be different. The argument put forward by the hon. and learned Member for Cork is, that because the large steamers require very little service in the port of Cork, that therefore it should be exempt from the provisions of the Bill. But the harbour authorities benefit by the dues which these vessels pay. The Bill is a fair compromise, and makes dock owners liable on the basis of the tonnage of the largest vessel which has been within their area, although the tonnage of the vessels usually trading to the port may be of far less tonnage. And this applies to Glasgow. Vessels as large as the "Oceanic" are built in Glasgow, and the harbour authorities receive nothing from them except small dues paid once only, and when they leave, after being fitted for sea, they may never be seen in Glasgow again. Nevertheless the largest of these vessels will, under this Bill, be the measure of liability of the harbour authorities in Glasgow. The Liverpool and New York liners call at Cork harbour three or four times a week, and every one of them pays harbour dues to the port; but the vessels built in Glasgow to which I have referred pay no dues except once, and are three times the tonnage of the average vessel trading to that port. In this respect the Bill would result in unfairness in the case of Glasgow, one of the largest ports in the country, just as it might be said that it would create unfairness in the case of Cork and other small ports. I do not see how this is to be avoided. The terms were agreed on by the Committee which considered the Bill, and the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division told us that they could not arrive at any better compromise. If this Amendment is accepted, it will give to Cork dockowners an exemption from the terms settled by the Committee as reasonable and fair to all dockowners. Glasgow, Belfast, and other ports might claim exemption on similar grounds.

MR. CALDWELL: I think the promoters of the Bill might very well accept the Amendment. We know very well that this Bill has been brought forward in the interests and for the benefit of the shipowners. It confers many advantages on them, and I think that they ought to accept what everyone must consider to be a very reasonable Amendment on behalf of the port of Cork. It is admitted that there is no logical reason or principle for the standard of liability which the Bill sets up as the maximum, but it has been pointed out that the liability in the case of Cork will be rather different from the liability in the case of large ports such as Liverpool or Glasgow. They have large vessels, but in Cork the liners make a merely incidental call to take up passengers and mails, without practically using the harbour in any way whatever. So far as the interests of Liverpool, Glasgow, and Leith are concerned it cannot make the smallest difference whether this Amendment is passed or not.

It does not affect any harbour in Scotland or England one iota, and they will get the full benefit of the Amendment which has been adopted. What is now asked is that vessels which merely call to take in passengers and mails should not be taken into consideration when estimating the maximum liability. The promoters object to this, but do they wish that the port of Cork should be liable for a sum equal to the value of an Atlantic liner ? Notoriously the harbour of Cork is used for local purposes, and yet it is now proposed to establish a law whereby the largest vessel calling at that port should be the measure of its maximum liability. Suppose a vessel of 1,000 tons were injured in Cork harbour, the liability of the authorities would not be £8,000, but would be an amount equal to eight times the tonnage of the largest vessel which had called at Cork during the preceding five years. Such a disparity is obviously absurd. It is admitted that there is no reason or principle in such a measure of liability. It is merely a fictitious standard, and I cannot see why the promoters, having got everything they wanted, should higgle about this Amendment, which really does not concern them.

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR: We object to this Amendment on principle, as well as because of the results that would follow from it. We see no reason whatever to discriminate between a vessel carrying passengers and mails and any other trading vessel, and we see no reason why a port should repudiate its responsibility in regard to such a vessel. The case of the "Oceanic" has been alluded to. Suppose that the "Oceanic" was damaged or sunk in Cork harbour, the value of the vessel and cargo would probably amount to about a million, and under the existing law the harbour authorities would be liable to that extent. By this clause it is proposed to reduce the liability in such a case from £1,000,000 to £8 per ton on 17,000 tons, or £136,000. The hon. and learned Member wants something more than that. He wants the liability of the port to be limited to £8 per ton on the largest vessel trading to Cork in the ordinary way, the tonnage of which might be 2,000 tons, and this would reduce the maximum liability of the port in respect of the "Oceanic" to £16,000. That is a proposition which seems to me to be quite out of the question, and certainly one which the shipowners will not accept. I venture to think if it were inserted in the Bill it would work in an exceedingly detrimental manner.

Mr. FIELD: I do not agree with the hon. Member who has just spoken. This is a shipowners' Bill, and the port and dock authorities have as far as possible endeavoured to meet them. The exception proposed with regard to Cork is to my mind perfectly natural, and I hold that Cork is entitled to exceptional treatment. I trust the promoters of this Bill will not put us to the trouble of dividing the House, and I hope they will meet us in that spirit of compromise which enabled the Bill to pass through the Standing Committee. The hon. Gentleman opposite said that the Irish Members looked upon the calling of the Atlantic steamers at Queenstown as a nuisance. That is not so; quite the contrary is the fact, and I repudiate that statement, because we have done everything we could by railway facilities and in other ways to give the Atlantic liners every convenience. I hope that this Amendment will be accepted.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: May I point out to the hon. Gentleman in charge of this Bill that his speech was against his own Amendment? His Amendment was to exempt from the provisions of this Bill vessels which had been fitted out or ballasted.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member in moving his Amendment expressly stated that he would not move those words, and I accordingly omitted them in putting the question.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: I did not notice that, Mr. Speaker; but even then the hon. Member has removed from the Amendment exceptions which he himself thought desirable.

*Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR: May I repeat what I have already said—namely, that I was desired by the hon. Member for Linlithgow to move the Amendment without these words.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: No doubt the hon. Member has probably been squeezed by the shipowners, but we now know what his mind was. He desired not merely shelter, but also ballast and repair.

The shipowners have driven him out of that position, and we now have it that ships coming in for ballast or repair are not to be excepted. I respecfully submit that the shipowners of the country are not to come here on a Wednesday afternoon and put a pistol to our heads and say, "You must take this Bill as we present it; we will give no concessions, and have no regard to local ports, no matter how injuriously this Bill will affect them." We have made enormous concessions to the shipowners, and they might take up some position of compromise. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Linlithgow is now limited to the pure question of a ship having been "within" the area, the provisions as to shelter, ballast, and repair being struck out. But when a ship calls and drops a bag of maize, the liability of the port is raised from the normal £10,000 to a million, and the shipowners say "We will make no further concessions; we are shipowners, and you are only the port authority." This is a port authority with a very small revenue, and already with enormous liabilities. It conducts its operations unselfishly, having nothing to gain from any one of them. The shipowners, who are making millions of money, say to the port authority, "You must undertake this enormous liability, because our ships drop a few bags of maize occasionally." Is that a proper position to take up? It has been admitted in this House from the very start that this Bill cannot be defended on grounds of abstract logic, and all we ask is that this port, which is poor compared with Liverpool or Glasgow, should not be burdened with this tremendous liability because these ships call once a week on the way to or from New York and drop a few bags of maize, or take up a few emigrant passengers. I would hope that, the Bill having got to this point, the Government will see their way to recommend to the hon. Gentleman behind them to facilitate the passing of the Bill by accepting this proposal. I am driven to the view of the hon. Member for Dundee, who stated very fairly that the case of the Scotch and Irish ports is exceptional, and that these ports should be exempted from this provision of the Bill. I do not believe myself that if the Bill passes into law the Scotch and Irish ports will gain much; but I can quite see that the small ports will be landed in greater responsibility than is their due. The principle of collaboration supposed to be contained in the Bill between merchant shippers and the ports has not been fairly carried out in the measure. The President of the Board of Trade should be asked what is his position in this matter, but unfortunately the Solicitor General is the only representative of the Government present. I can quite feel that the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University must, as Solicitor General for England, look at this question, affecting the country in which he was born and bred, from an English point of view. His breast must be torn by conflicting emotions in regard to the case of England and that of Ireland. Officially, I will not say financially, he is bound to protect the shipping interests; and it appears to me, as there is no other gentleman connected with the Government on the Treasury Bench, that the right hon. Gentleman would be relieved to a certain extent if he had the assistance of the President of the Board of Trade in a matter of this kind. I will not move the adjournment of the debate, but I think we have arrived at a position of affairs when his presence is most desirable. If the Solicitor General for England takes up the position that we have right on our side, we would not need the assistance of a higher authority; but if he is precluded from expressing an opinion favourable to our views, we are entitled to the presence of other members of the Cabinet. For the moment, I suggest that this is a case when the matter should be considered at a future date. At any rate we would like to know the opinion of the Government upon it.

*SIR CHARLES CAYZER (Barrow-in-Furness): Although I do not altogether agree with all that the hon. and learned Member for Cork has said about shipowners, I admit he has some grounds for his Amendment, and I should like to appeal to the hon. Member in charge of the Bill not to press his opposition to the particular grievance in regard to this matter. The port of Cork is situated very differently from other ports, and if the Amendment proposed were accepted, I think it would apply to that port alone. It has been said that it would apply to Southampton; but I do not think so, for there the ships take in cargo. I should be sorry that the Bill should be talked out if this Amendment were not accepted. I think

I express the opinion of the general body of the shipowners and dock-owners of this country, that they are desirous of having this Bill, which gives them advantages they do not at present possess. It appears to me that the great objectors to the Amendment are the owners of the large Atlantic liners running to and from Liverpool; but even if the Amendment were accepted they would receive many advantages if the Bill passed. I therefore appeal to the hon. Member who has charge of the Bill to accept the Amendment, but if it is pressed to a division I shall vote for it.

MR. C. H. WILSON (Hull, W.): As one of the Members connected with shipping, although my name is not on the Bill, I rise to suggest to the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool, in charge of the Bill, that this additional Amendment should be accepted. The Bill, although not altogether logical, is a compromise which has been arranged between the harbour authorities and the shipowners, and will ease the mind of the shipowners, because, although it may not be known to many Members of the House, accidents have occurred in the Manchester Ship Canal, for instance, and elsewhere, and have caused very serious loss to the shipowners. I think that hon. Members below the gangway have treated the Bill, on the whole, very fairly. Personally, I think the Amendment is reasonable, and I cordially support it.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): If I may venture to tender advice to the hon. Member for the Exchange Division, I think he would be well advised to accept the Amendment. It appears to me that there is real substantial ground for the exemption of Cork, because the limitation of liability of dock-owners is fixed in respect of the duty to provide accommodation in the docks. But this is a question not of the vessels going into dock, but of the vessels lying out in the stream. The reason for imposing liability here is much less, because the harbour authority does not give dock accommodation for these large vessels, which only come into the harbour to drop mails and a few bags of maize. There are other considerations which would make it obvious why the hon. Gentleman should accept the Amendment.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: If the hon. Member merely means that the Amendment applies only to Cork, which is an intermediate stage, and not a port of destination, the question is very much narrower than appears at first sight. Although the Government take no part in the Bill, so far as I am personally concerned, I would vote for the Amendment as a proper one, if it goes to a division.

Question put and agreed to.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have put down an Amendment on the Paper to leave out Sub-section 3. I must ask the House to allow me to read Sub-section 3—-

> "Sub-section 3 of the said Section 503 shall apply to this section as if the words 'owners of every sea-going ship or share thereof,' included a harbour authority and a conservancy authority, and the owner of a canal or of a dock."

Now, the sub-section of the Act of 1894, which is to be applied to this sub-section, is in these words—

> "The owner of every sea-going ship or share therein shall be liable in respect of every such loss of life, personal injury, loss of or damage to vessels, goods, merchandise, or things as aforesaid arising on distinct occasions to the same extent as if no other loss, injury, or damage had arisen."

Now, I ask any hon. Gentleman who has heard me whether he knows in the least the effect of these words? It seems to me that this is one of the most vicious cases of draughtsmanship by reference. We all know what abuses have arisen from this draughtsmanship. Some of us who have been behind the scenes know the history of it. The real reason is that it was a device resorted to by the Treasury draughtsman in order to get behind the intelligence of the House of Commons because of organised obstruction. But we have ceased to know what organised obstruction is in this House, and whatever ground the Treasury draughtsman may have had for adopting this course, I deny that it is available to the draughtsman of a private Bill. I do not know whether this sub-section was originated in the Standing Committee or not. I have pointed out that this new sub-section, in itself obscure, contains almost as many words as the original sub-section to which it refers. I appeal to the hon. Gentleman who is in charge of the Bill, if he wishes to include this sub-section in his measure, to write out in plain English what it is that it means. Let him tell us what he means to legislate about, and let us know what we are doing. He takes in an extremely difficult sub-section from an Act not before the House and applies it as if the words "owner of a ship" included the "owner of a dock." I do not presume to say what the result of this sub-section would be, and I believe it would require a great deal of study to say what it would be. I do submit that this is not a proper, or even a decent way of legislating on this important matter. The hon. Member must know what is the effect intended by these words, and my appeal is that he should withdraw them now and formulate a sentence just as if the sub-section in the old Act did not exist at all. He can do it now, or do it at some later stage of the Bill, as the Bill could easily be recommitted. I have another objection suggested to me by a harbour authority which is apprehensive that this Sub-section 3 imposes on harbour authorities a liability which by the present law does not exist. It is extremely difficult to come to any conclusion on the matter, but having regard to the Amendment which has just been passed I think the point ceases to have any importance, and I am not disposed to insist on it. But on the other point, that we ought to have the intention of the Legislature put in plain terms, the hon. Gentleman should give us the direct result which he wishes to produce. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 4, to leave out Sub-section (3)."—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section 3 stand part of the clause."

SIR EDWARD CARSON: This Amendment is one of a very technical character, and proposes to leave out Sub-section 3. I quite agree with what my hon. and learned friend says, that the original sub-section is very difficult to apply to the case of both a ship and a dock. I think it is quite plain that the object was to enact that a dock company should not be allowed to limit its liability in the case of two accidents occurring from the same cause, as if it were all one accident. I would suggest to my hon. friend who is in charge of the Bill that as regards a dock that question could seldom or ever arise, for it could never be argued that it would be a continuing wrong on the part of the dock-owner. I would suggest to him whether, in his discretion, it would not be better to accept the Amendment.

*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: The Bill was referred to the Standing Committee on Law. The object of the sub-section was to put the position of the dock-owners and shipowners on the same footing. I do not myself see the difficulty of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, but, having regard to the views of the right hon. the Solicitor General, I am quite willing, on behalf of the promoters of the Bill, to withdraw the sub-section.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to move, as a separate clause at the end of Sub-section 6:—

"Provided that nothing in this section shall impose any liability in respect of any such loss or damage on any such owners or authority in any case where no such liability would have existed if this Act had not passed."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

MIDWIVES BILL.

Order for Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now considered."

MR. BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) said it was rather a strong thing, when a Bill had been read a second time and referred to a Standing Committee, to ask the House, when the Bill came back, to again consider it. But there were reasons why in the case of the present Bill such a course should be taken. He took that course because the Bill, in his opinion, had never been properly considered by the House. It came on most unexpectedly on a Friday afternoon, upon the Government business having suddenly come to an end, and was therefore debated inadequately in a very thin House; there was a very small division, and then it was sent to the Standing Committee. A Standing Committee was an excellent institution when a Government Bill could not be got through in a reasonable time, but in the case of a private Bill it was most unsatisfactory, except to the promoters. By a little careful whipping on the part of private Members it was always possible to get a private Bill through a Standing Committee with a very inadequate discussion. This Bill, having been inadequately discussed on Second Reading, had been rushed through the Standing Committee, and had now come back to the House; and it was only proper that the House should now consider whether or not it should be allowed to go through without further consideration. It was a most important measure. It was contrary to the tendency of legislation in these matters. The whole tendency of legislation had been in favour of greater medical and scientific methods, and substituting the medical practitioner for the quack. The present Bill was for the purpose of setting up a class of people as being people partially qualified to act in these matters, and he ventured to think that fatal results would follow if it were passed into law. The law as it at present stood provided that the only person who could practise midwifery was a qualified practitioner, qualified in medicine, surgery, and midwifery, and it was now proposed to legalise a class of persons who did not possess these qualifications. If it were a case of natural labour, a knowledge of midwifery would be sufficient; but as in almost every case abnormal symptoms developed it was absolutely necessary that a person should be present who was qualified in all the three subjects. He recognised the excellent object which the promoters of the Bill had in view. There was a very large amount of preventable mortality—something like 10,000 deaths per annum—the whole of which might be prevented if proper care were taken. That was a terrible state of things to contemplate, and one which certainly ought to be stopped if possible; but the Bill before the House would not stop it, for the reason that poor people would be induced to employ these partially qualified persons much more frequently than was now the case. For all these reasons a Bill of this kind ought to be very carefully considered. The House ought to see that it contained such checks and safeguards that great abuses might not occur. But when this Bill was examined it was found to be so badly drafted that the whole of a Wednesday afternoon would not give sufficient time to amend it by the insertion of those checks and safeguards. There should be, in the first place, full local control, and, in the second, where these persons did anything contrary to their certificate they should immediately be brought to book and fined. There were no such safeguards in the Bill. Under Clause 8 there was a certain control. The county council is to be the board of control in its own area. They may delegate their power to the district council, who may, in their turn, delegate it to a local committee. But the power of the local committee would only extend so far as to send a report to a body called the Midwifery Board, and that Board, when it had made up its mind, would have power only to suspend the midwife and nothing more. The result of this Bill would be that all cases of abnormal labour could be attended simply by a midwife, when it was absolutely necessary that a doctor should be present. There was no control whatever, and, naturally, irregularities would result. Did the promoters really mean that midwives were to undertake cases of abnormal labour or not? The Bill at the present time was extraordinarily vague upon that point, and under it the midwives could undertake all cases, whether abnormal or not. He ventured to ask the House whether it was worth while to proceed further with the measure at the present time. He did not speak on behalf of the medical profession, although possibly that suggestion might be made, but at the same time he thought it was hard that the opposition of the medical profession, which was almost unanimous, should be said to be an interested opposition. He begged to move that the Bill be considered this day three months.

*COLONEL MILWARD (Stratford-on-Avon), rising to second the Amendment, said he thought the disadvantage of sending a Bill of this kind to a Grand Committee had been very clearly shown from the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member for Tunbridge. Everybody who had sat on a Grand Committee knew that it was very often extremely difficult to get a quorum. The result was a very small number of Members attended. It was true that Bills were sometimes considered in Committee of the whole House by a small number of Members, but all Members might attend if they chose. This was not so with regard to Grand Committees. When a Bill was sent to a Standing Committee it was withdrawn from the cognisance of the House, and when it came back hon. Members interested in it were in a difficult position, because the easy answer to any Amendment they might propose was, "This Bill has been considered by the Standing Committee." If the Bill had been considered in Committee of the whole House they would not have had this discussion now, but through its being sent to a Standing Committee the whole matter would have to be entered into *de novo*, and the Report stage would be turned into another Committee stage. He objected to the Bill. Bills for the registration of plumbers and for the registration of architects had been introduced, and now a similar Bill had been brought in for the registration of midwives. Where was this system of registration to stop? Two of the hon. Members interested in this measure were country gentlemen, and he did not know why there should not be a Bill for the examination and registration of country gentlemen. He did not allude to physical examination, but when there were such bodies as county councils, district councils, and parish councils, not to mention more important bodies, such as Quarter Sessions and assizes, he imagined it was just as necessary to examine country gentlemen for their qualifications as any other class. He trusted that sooner or later they would go back to the good old time when people had not to be examined and registered in this way. The mover of the Amendment objected to the Bill from the doctors' point of view, and he was right in so doing. If there was to be a class of certificated midwives they should be hedged in in every possible way. He (Colonel Milward) objected to it on behalf of the numberless women who assisted the poor in the capacity of nurses in the time of their trouble and suffering. The whole condition of the country with regard to lying-in and midwifery would be changed under the Bill. A great many good women in the country attended and nursed their neighbours in their labour, and in the great majority of cases in a proper manner. It was not so dangerous a matter as laymen supposed; in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred no dangerous symptoms supervened, and when they did there was always ample time to send for a doctor. This Bill said that after January, 1902, no woman, as a midwife, should attend a woman in labour under a penalty of £5 unless she was certificated. The reform, if it were a reform, would affect the 21,000 women who were attending their fellow women throughout the country. It was perfectly true that the Bill provided that those women would, with the consent of the medical council, be allowed to continue in practice, but those women would die out in the country districts before they could be replaced by the certified midwives. He was not averse to the general proposals of the Bill, but he thought it was far too drastic, and the House ought to be prepared to safeguard the position of the women who were now doing, and doing well, this kind of work.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Boscawen.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*SIR JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities) hoped that the Bill might be allowed to proceed on the ground that it was a measure of great importance affecting public health. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment suggested that all women in labour should be placed under the care of medical men. This would do away with the midwife, who had existed from remote ages, and would exist till the world's end. It had been said that a large section of the medical profession objected to the registration of midwives, but on the other hand a large section approved. The Medical Council approved generally of the Bill before the House, and had accepted its general principles. They had made suggestions from time to time, the influence of which was to be seen in the Bill. He would not say the Bill was all that he could wish, but it was a step in the right direction, and he hoped it would be allowed to proceed.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said he entirely sympathised with the hon. and gallant Member for Stratford-on-Avon who supported the rejection of the Bill. A great many, too many, Bills were sent to Standing Committees. Owing to his position on the Committee of Selection he was debarred from assisting at those Committees, and not only himself, but many other hon. Gentlemen were unable to take part in measures in which they were interested, because they were sent upstairs. They ought to be discussed in the House itself. He did not associate himself with the objection to the registration of midwives; doctors were registered, and all it was proposed to do was to put an inferior class of practitioner on the same scale as to registration as the higher branch of the medical profession. He did not agree that the Bill had been insufficiently discussed. It had been discussed before the Standing Committee, and if it had not been discussed at greater length upon this occasion it was through the pure accident of the position it held on the Paper. A large number of doctors opposed it, but an equally large number were in favour of it, and the one balanced the other. Two-thirds of the poor women were attended when in labour by their own sex, and there was a very strong feeling against what was called men-midwives. But these women who attended were usually stupid, old, and unqualified to perform these duties, and were not uncommonly both dirty and ignorant. They ought to be trained and registered. Puerperal fever could be eradicated entirely by cleanliness and proper care and precaution, and if these women were qualified it would disappear. He hoped when the Bill came up again a good measure would be the result, but at the same time he supported the principle of it.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick), in supporting the measure, said the mover of the Amendment addressed the House from the point of view of the doctor. The hon. Gentleman who seconded it pleaded for liberty for midwives pure and simple. Those gentlemen represented vested interests of one kind or another, but the House ought to consider the matter from the larger standpoint of the interests of the women of England and the coming generations; that was the standpoint from which the great majority of the medical profession regarded it. The hon. Gentlemen who opposed this measure did not realise that the great majority of the births of this country were attended not by doctors but by women of no qualification. What was required, and what the Bill was intended to provide, was that some sort of qualification should be made compulsory, although too high a qualification could not be given at once. Had the mover of the Amendment been in this country and able to take part in the discussion when the Bill was before the Standing Committee, he would have seen that the Committee considered all the points he had raised and did their best to meet them. The importance of the measure went far beyond the interests of either doctors or midwives. The evils it endeavoured to meet were tremendous. Thousands of preventable deaths took place every year. Puerperal fever could be eradicated, and the numberless deaths of infants, together with the blindness of children, could be prevented. A comparatively small amount of training would be sufficient to avoid those dangers, and a little knowledge would let these women know when abnormal cases or dangerous symptoms occurred, and when the doctor ought to be summoned. This knowledge on the part of the midwives would make abnormal cases infinitely safer, because the doctor would then be summoned at the proper time. He hoped the Bill would receive the consideration of the House.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) considered the measure one of considerable importance, and for that very reason he wished it to be postponed. It was one for which he believed he was himself to a certain extent responsible, for the reason that some years ago he had been struck by the horrors which had been referred to, and had moved the Medical Council in the matter. He was not prepared, however, to vote for a Bill that would abrogate the Medical Acts of 1857 and 1886 by creating a new class of practitioner, which was unnecessary in the interests of the public. What was required was that in child-birth women should have properly educated nurses to look after them, whose knowledge was sufficient to enable them to judge when the local practitioner was necessary. In that position these women would do an infinite amount of good, but if they were put upon a register they would be put in a position to become independent practitioners. He did not think that any law would attempt to prevent a woman giving aid to another in her time of tribulation and danger. What was required in the interests of public health and in the interest of the mass of the people was that they should have properly qualified women to attend as monthly nurses or midwives. The Bill under consideration did not do that, and provided no security for it, and in his opinion the House ought to give it further and longer consideration. Fourteen Amendments had been put down on the very morning of the day it came on for consideration, and there were a score of Amendments which would necessitate considerable discussion. He did not know whether the Government were prepared to back the Bill in its present form—he believed not; and, for the reason that it had not been properly considered, he thought the House ought to support the Amendment before the House. It was in his opinion too large a question to be initiated by a private Member, and he hoped in another session the Government would take the matter up and bring in such a Bill as could be passed into law.

Mr. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) agreed in wishing that this matter should be dealt with by the Government of the day——

It being half-past Five of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

HIGHWAYS AND BRIDGES ACT (1891) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 2:—

Question again proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Jonathan Samuel.*) —put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday next.

STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

SHOP HOURS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD.

Ordered, That a Select Committee of Five Members of this House be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith, and to request that their Lordships will be pleased to appoint an equal number of Lords to be joined with the Members of this House.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Sir William Walrond.*)

NEW BILL.

NON-COUNTY BOROUGHS.

Bill to amend the Law relating to Non-County Boroughs, ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Holland, Mr.

Oldroyd, Mr. Lyttleton, and Mr. Griffith-Boscawen.

NON-COUNTY BOROUGHS BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Non-County Boroughs," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 9th July, and to be printed. [Bill 270.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]. Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]. Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

Colonel GUNTER reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills, That the parties opposing the Hemel Hempstead Corporation (Water) Bill had stated that the evidence of Walter Edward Henry Dowling and of the Reverend Charles Augustus Leveson, and of Samuel Whitley Basil was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that their attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Walter Edward Henry Dowling, and the Reverend Charles Augustus Leveson, and Samuel Whitley Basil do attend the said Committee To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Walter Edward Henry Dowling, and the Reverend Charles Augustus Leveson, and Samuel Whitley Basil do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

SCARBOROUGH CORPORATION BILL

Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section B), with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

TAUNTON CORPORATION BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section B), with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS.

On the Motion for Adjournment,

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I would ask whether the Government has anything to communicate as to events in China.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): We have received two brief telegrams, each confirming the information received from unofficial sources that Tientsin has been relieved. The first comes from the consul at Tientsin, dated 23rd June, viâ Chefoo, 27th June, and is as follows—

> "British column, under Major Morris, Royal Welsh Fusiliers, and Naval Brigade, under Commander Cradock, arrived at noon, 550 men strong; 1,500 Russians are reported to be at Tientsin railway station; 150 Americans and 50 Italians have also arrived."

The second telegram left Ta-ku, 25th June, 3 p.m., viâ Chefoo, 27th June, and is from the Rear Admiral—

> "Commander Cradock, commanding British contingent Tientsin relief, reports Tientsin communicated with and reinforced 23rd June. Commander-in-Chief reported ten miles from Tientsin, hampered by sick and wounded, and engaged with enemy."

That is the extent of our official information; but the House will recollect that the unofficial telegrams to the same effect, which were correct in other respects, stated that the force had moved north in order to communicate with the Commander-in-Chief.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 28th June, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

HALIFAX CORPORATION BILL.

WEST BROMWICH CORPORATION BILL.

Reports of Her Majesty's Attorney General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

BUENOS AYRES AND ROSARIO RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

COSTA RICA RAILWAY COMPANY, LIMITED, BILL [H.L.].

CHRISTCHURCH AND BOURNEMOUTH TRAMWAYS BILL.

Committed.

BLACKPOOL, ST. ANNE'S, AND LYTHAM TRAMWAYS BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

BEXHILL AND ROTHERFIELD RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

Reported with Amendments.

BEDFORD GAS BILL.

Reported without amendment.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on 18th June and Friday last discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

MOUNTAIN ASH WATER BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered and agreed to, with Amendments; and Bill returned to the Commons.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD BILL [H.L.].

PAIGNTON URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

ROE'S PATENT BILL [H.L.].

Read 2^a.

MANCHESTER CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.]

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

HAMILTON BURGH BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

Standing Order No. 93 considered (according to Order), and dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of the Promoters of the Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Company Bill. Leave given to present the said Petition.

OLDHAM CORPORATION BILL.

WEST HAM CORPORATION BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a and referred to the Examiners.

BREWERY AND COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT TRUST, LIMITED, BILL [H.L.].

BRISTOL WATER BILL [H.L.].

COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE COMPANY BILL [H.L.].

MILFORD DOCKS BILL [H.L.]

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (GAS) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL. (No. 140.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL. (No. 141.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11) BILL. (No. 142.)

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL. (No. 143.)

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Telegrams respecting hospital accommodation for the troops in South Africa.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Draft Order in Council constituting a Consultative Committee of the Board of Education.

EXPLOSIVES.

Twenty-fourth Annual Report of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Explosives.

TRADE REPORTS.

I. Annual Series:

No. 2463. Honduras;
No. 2464. Mexico (the State of Sonora);
No. 2465. United States (Porto Rico);
No. 2466. Venezuela (Caracas and District);
No. 2467. China (Samshui).

II. Miscellaneous Series:

No. 530. Brazil (Report on the State of Amazonas).

INDIA (RAILWAYS).

Administration Report on the railways in India for 1899–1900.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY (SCOTLAND).

General rules for the government of the asylum situated at Kirklands, in the county of Lanark.

SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS FUND) (SAVINGS BANKS FUND) (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES FUND).

Accounts for the year ended 31st December, 1899.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PETITIONS.

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION BILL.

Petitions for amendment of; of Bank of New South Wales; Commercial Banking Company of Sydney; City Bank of Sydney; and Trustees of Savings Bank of New South Wales; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD.

Message from the Commons that they have appointed a Committee, to consist of five Members, to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in its constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body, and to request that their Lordships will be pleased to appoint an equal number of Lords to be joined with the Members of that House.

SECRETARIES TO IRISH COUNTY COUNCILS.

The Earl of ARRAN: My Lords, in view of the unsatisfactory answer which I received on Tuesday* from my noble friend the Earl of Denbigh, to the question I then put to him, I beg to give notice that I shall at an early date again call attention to the matter.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: Seeing the noble Marquess the Prime Minister in his place, I wish to ask whether he can communicate to the House any information with regard to the state of affairs in China.

The PRIME MINISTER and SECRETARY of STATE for FOR-

---

* See page 1067 of this volume.

EIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): I very much wish I could give the House some information which I could confidently claim to be of an authoritative character. So far as we know, the Admiral has been relieved and is safe; but I think, if I mistake not, that that comes from information other than an official source, and beyond that we know nothing of the position of Sir Claude MacDonald and the members of the other Legations. I think there is every ground for hoping that no violence has as yet been done to them, but even that can only be stated in a hypothetical form. With respect to the future, the noble Earl knows as much as I do. From all quarters such troops as can be obtained are being hurried forward, but they must take some time before they can arrive.

LAND REGISTRY (NEW BUILDINGS) BILL.

Read 2^a (according to Order), and committed.

BURIAL AUTHORITIES (CREMATION) BILL.

Order for the House to go into Committee read.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: May I ask the noble Lord in charge of the Bill to modify a little its title? The "Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill" has a most gruesome sound.

LORD MONKSWELL: I understand that the noble Lord representing the Home Office has a suggestion to make for altering the title.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1:—

LORD BELPER: The Amendment standing in my name to this clause is the first of a series which I have to move on behalf of the Home Office. The effect of the first Amendment is to alter the title of the Bill, and to make Clause 1 read:—

"That this Act may be cited as the Cremation Act, 1900."

That Amendment not only answers the objection taken by the Prime Minister to the wording of the title, but also has the object of widening the scope of the Bill. Under the present law the only people who are dealt with under regulations, if they have crematoria, are certain local authorities, and the Bill as drawn only applies to burial authorities. The Home Office think it right that private crematoria, although they have been already established, should be subject to regulations which may be drawn up by the Home Office. The Amendments standing in my name to Clauses 5 and 6 will carry that out more fully.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 5, to leave out 'Burial Authorities (Cremation),' and to insert 'Cremation.'"

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I observe that the noble Lord has introduced a new word into the English language—"crematorium." Is that desirable?

LORD BELPER: I understand that it has been used in other cases, and that it may safely be accepted as expressing what is intended.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:

LORD BELPER: My first Amendment is simply for the purpose of making the definition of "burial authority" conform to the definition in the Burial Acts. The second Amendment defines the expression "crematorium" to mean any building fitted with appliances for the burning of human remains.

Amendments moved—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 7, to leave out after 'burial authority' to end of clause and to insert 'shall mean any burial board, any council committee or other local authority having the powers and duties of a burial board, and any local authority maintaining a cemetery under the public Health (Interments) Act, 1879, or under any local Act'; and in page 1, after line 9, to insert 'The expression "crematorium" shall mean any building fitted with appliances for the burning of human remains.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 4:—

LORD BELPER: Clause 4 will not be necessary with the Amendments which it is proposed to make to Clause 5. Under those Amendments the regulations that are made by the Secretary of State will refer to private crematoria as well as to those under public authority.

Moved, "That Clause 4 be omitted."—(*Lord Belper.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, line 6, to leave out 'in such place.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

LORD MONKSWELL said it had been suggested to him, but he did not think it could be the case, that by leaving out these words an important alteration might be effected in the law. At present there was a legal decision that the burning of human remains was not an offence unless committed so as to cause a public nuisance or to prevent a coroner's inquest. If these words were omitted from the clause it would be supposed that the law was intended to be altered so as to make illegal what was now legal.

LORD BELPER: I can assure the noble Lord that, so far as I know, there is no such intention in the Amendment. Clause 6 as it stands refers to crematoria under public authority, and the object of the Amendment is to make it apply generally and give power to deal with any crematorium in any place. But I will inquire into the point the noble Lord has raised.

LORD MONKSWELL said he called attention to the matter because he did not think it would be desirable to make such an important change in the law on a Bill of this kind.

LORD BELPER: I will inquire.

Amendment agreed to.

LORD BELPER: The next Amendment standing in my name deals with the penalties in the Bill. The penalty in the case where anyone makes a false certificate or a false declaration is quite inadequate. The object is to guard as far as possible against burning being made use of in order to conceal a crime, and in such a case it is very desirable that the penalty should be much larger than that proposed in the Bill—namely, a fine of £50. I propose to omit the words "liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding £50," and to insert "liable to imprisonment with or without hard labour not exceeding two years."

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, page 2, to eave out 'liable' to 'pounds' in line 15, and to insert 'to imprisonment with or without hard labour not exceeding two years.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 7 and 8 amended, and agreed to.

LORD BELPER: I now have to move a new clause, the object of which is to bring all crematoria that have been established under private Acts under this general Act, which is to deal with them all. I believe the model clauses that have been agreed to in most of these cases will be very similiar to those which the Secretary of State will make under this Bill, but it is desirable that they should be brought under one general Act.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new clause:—'On the commencement of this Act any provision of any local and personal Act for a like purpose as this Act and any bye-laws or regulations made thereunder shall, so far as they relate to that purpose, cease to be in operation.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

LORD MONKSWELL said the House was rather in the dark at to the particular provisions which might be contained in the private Acts. He thought that some injustice might therefore be done by the insertion of the new clause.

LORD BELPER: I will postpone the clause till the Standing Committee if the noble Lord wishes. But this is an Amendment which the Government will feel bound to insist upon. When there is a general Act it is very undesirable that there should be exceptions.

LORD MONKSWELL said he would accept the new clause now, but if he found that any local authorities considered they would be badly used by its passing, he would submit an Amendment in Standing Committee.

New clause agreed to.

Other Amendments agreed to; Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 137.)

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

*LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN: My Lords, there is only one observation I desire to make at this stage of the Bill. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee and certain amendments made, only one of which I think it is necessary for me to mention. I refer to the omission of the clause inserted at the instance of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, requiring the leave of a Judge or other judicial person before any proceedings could be commenced under the Bill if it became law. The Committee were unanimously of opinion that that clause would impede the working of the Act, and that it was not necessary, but I wish to say that if my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack insists upon its insertion I shall not feel able to oppose him. At the same time my noble and learned friend will probably not think it right to discuss the matter at this stage, as he will have another opportunity of doing so should he adhere to his view.

Amendments proposed by the Select Committee, agreed to.

Moved, "That the Standing Committee be negatived."—(*Lord Russell of Killowen.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): Of course, the noble Lord has a perfect right to move that the Standing Committee be negatived, but I think it is rather contrary to our rule in a Bill of this sort.

*LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN: I am informed that when a Bill has been before a Select Committee, on which there were several legal persons, it is usual to negative the Standing Committee, but if I am wrong in that I will not press the motion.

On Question, agreed to; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I trust that the Bill which is now submitted to your Lordships for Second Reading will meet, not only with your formal assent, but also with your full approbation. Your Lordships will remember that for some time past attention has been called to the very large number of accidents which occur to railway servants. In consequence of that state of things, the President of the Board of Trade, at the commencement of last session, introduced a Bill into the other House of Parliament to deal with the subject. A great deal of criticism was applied to that Bill, and the view was expressed that, as it imposed very serious obligations on the railway companies and the means for carrying them out were uncertain, it was advisable that the matter should be deferred until after an inquiry had taken place. My right hon. friend Mr. Ritchie yielded to that view, and a Royal Commission was appointed. That Commission has now reported, and this Bill is almost an echo of that Report. I will place before your Lordships the main facts upon which the Bill is founded. In the year 1898—I take the figures of 1898, as they were the figures before the Commission—there were 534,141 railway servants employed in the United Kingdom, and of those persons 542 were killed and 13,000 were injured. The relative proportion may be thought not very excessive, but these figures have to be first analysed and then considered. It must be remembered that of these 534,141 men many run no risk at all. For instance, there are 53,800 clerks employed in offices who can incur no greater danger in their service than any one of your Lordships sitting in his library, and 77,000 mechanics who work in factories under the supervision of the Home Office, and in respect of whom no return of accidents has been made. Without making these deductions the figures I have quoted show that 1·24 of every 1,000 servants employed are killed in the year and thirty-one in every 1,000 injured. But, as I have said, those figures do not represent the real facts upon which this Bill is founded. There are different degrees of danger. The clerks, as I have said, run no danger at all, while of 25,543 signalmen only nine are killed and 175 injured. We found that we could localise the dangerous portions of the operations, and we were able to demonstrate that a certain portion of the work of railway operatives represents the most dangerous trade that is carried on in this kingdom. The danger mostly comes in dealing with the wagons engaged in the goods and mineral trade when they are in motion, and the persons who are principally employed in what are called the shunting operations, and who are, therefore, exposed to the greatest danger, are the goods guards and the shunters who have charge of the making up of the trains, and the marshalling of the carriages which form the trains. There is also another particularly dangerous trade—that carried on by the platelayers. Of the 14,720 goods guards employed, forty-three were killed and 902 injured; of the 63,360 platelayers employed 122 were killed and 1,020 injured; and of the small number of shunters employed—9,244—forty-seven were killed and 723 injured. Therefore, of the goods guards, about 3·92, or, substantially, four men in every 1,000, were killed and sixty-one injured; of the platelayers, 1·9 per 1,000 were killed and sixteen injured, and of the shunters, 5·08 per 1,000 were killed and seventy-eight in every 1,000 injured. May I ask the House for one moment to consider what these figures mean. If any one of your Lordships found that out of 1,000 men he employed five were killed and seventy-eight injured per year he would feel that a duty was cast upon him as the employer to see that some steps were taken to remedy that state of things. Whilst accidents to railway servants generally have decreased during the past thirty years—every credit is due to the railway companies for what they have done in that direction—accidents to shunters have, unfortunately, increased. The number of shunters killed in 1872 was twenty-five, but in 1898 it was forty-seven. The trade in this country which is generally supposed to be the most dangerous is that of the mercantile marine, but, while in 1898 there were 5·2 deaths per 1,000 in the mercantile marine, the number of accidents which are not fatal is exceedingly small. Therefore the figures in the trade which is supposed to be the most dangerous do not come up to those which I have just quoted in respect of goods guards, shunters, and platelayers. In regard to other trades which have been treated by the Legislature as dangerous, I find that in coal mines 1·28 per 1,000 are killed, as against 5·08 per 1,000 of shunters; in metalliferous mines, 0·96 per 1,000 are killed; in factories in the non-textile trades, 0·2 per 1,000 are killed; in factories in the textile trades, 0·1 per 1,000 are killed; and in the shipbuilding trade the number of fatal accidents is only 0·5 per 1,000. Therefore it is established that the work in which a certain portion of the railway servants are engaged is by far the most dangerous trade in the country. So far as I know, it is the only dangerous trade now uncontrolled by the protection of the State; and we have to consider whether there is any reason why railway companies should cease to be excepted from the general rules of legislation. Railway servants who work in factories are already under the control of the Home Office. Is there any reason why railway servants who work under a roof and run very little risk of accident should be protected while those who work in the open air and run great risks should not be protected? That is the question your Lordships have to consider. It may assist your Lordships in coming to a conclusion as to whether we should proceed by some sort of legislation or not if you take into consideration the finding of the Commission. The Commission was composed of men the great majority of whom had had large experience of railway operations. The managers of railway companies, the directors of railway companies, and the operatives employed were represented, and they came to this unanimous conclusion—that the deaths occurring and the injuries sustained amongst railway servants are unnecessarily great in number, and can, by means of authoritative action, be diminished. Well, my Lords, that necessarily imposes the duty on someone to see that the authoritative action takes place. As far as I know there can be only two ways of dealing with a subject like this. One is by imposing certain statutory obligations upon railway companies and those who have the charge and the direction of these workmen. That is clearly a very unelastic method. What is required for one set of things would not be required for another, and a general enactment imposing obligations of a fixed character which could not be altered to suit circumstances may produce great hardships and be perfectly insufficient to effect the object desired. Therefore, the Commission reported that it would be well to follow the precedent afforded by legislative action in similar matters, and to impose upon the Board of Trade the duty of regulating the matters dealt with in the Bill in the same way as the duty of making regulations for the carrying on of other trades is now imposed on the Home Office To what Department of the State ought the duty of regulation to be entrusted ? There are at least thirteen or fourteen different powers now exercised by the Board of Trade in respect of railways, and it would be unbusinesslike not to give that Board the power of regulating these dangerous trades. The Commission thought, however, that it would be very desirable that the great power, as it will be, which the Bill will confer should be exercised with great care and moderation. It is difficult to compare loss of human life and great injury with any other considerations. The railway companies do not ask that any consideration should be given to them on the score of expense. In their evidence they state—

> " Do not let financial considerations interfere with the action of the Commission or the Legislature in dealing with this matter."

In fact, I found nothing but a genuine desire on the part of the representatives of the railway companies to assist in carrying out legislation which will protect the men working on the railways from accidents. They are as anxious as anyone to see a remedy found for the dangerous condition of the trade. But there are some considerations that must be taken into account. It must be remembered that the railway companies represent the whole of the trade of the country, and therefore anything that throws such a burden upon them as will prevent them from carrying on their work ought not to be enacted. Therefore, throughout the Bill, every care has been taken to secure that the duty imposed on the Board of Trade shall be exercised after due consideration for the interests of the railway companies, so that they shall not be called upon to bear unnecessary burdens, but should at the same time be required to carry out such operations as will prevent accidents. Clause 4 provides that—

> " The Board of Trade, in considering any objection to a draft rule, and the Commissioners in considering any objection referred to them, shall, amongst other matters, have regard to the question whether the requirements of the rule would materially interfere with the trade of the country, or with the necessary operations of any railway company."

Power is given to the Board of Trade to draw up rules affecting the carrying on of operations in shunting yards, and in order to give the railway companies all reasonable protection power of appeal from the Board of Trade to the Railway Commission is given. Of course, the great question affecting the public interest in this matter is what is called the automatic coupling. It was the basis of the Bill of last year, and in that Bill the obligation was imposed on railway companies within a period of five years to attach an automatic coupling to every carriage used. A great deal is to be said on that subject. As far as the investigation of the Commission went, we were unable to say that a satisfactory automatic coupling had been found which would meet the requirements of our system in England, though we had 187 patents before us. The Commissioners were powerless to deal with the subject, but what is enacted in this Bill is that the railway companies shall co-operate with the Board of Trade in any experiment they undertake, which will make it practically certain that automatic couplings will come into operation when it has been established to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade, by practical testing, that any particular form is a success. The object of automatic couplings, of course, is to prevent men from passing between the wagons, but as there is no automatic uncoupler the men always have to go between the wagons for the purpose of uncoupling or to employ that very unsatisfactory appliance, the pole, for that purpose. It is possible that, by the co-operation of the Board of Trade with the railway companies, a lever coupling may be discovered which will perform both operations and remove the great risks which at present exist. I have stated in the main all the provisions of the Bill, and have given the House a general outline of them. I am aware that the Bill does not represent any heroic legislation, and that it has no political significance of any character. It may therefore attract but little attention, and excite no enthusiasm, but, at the same time, I do hope that your Lordships will be of opinion that a very fair attempt has been made to deal with the subject involved, and if the Bill becomes law I am certain that it will be no discredit to the Legislature that it gave a little of its time to passing a Bill essentially to benefit a portion of the community who are not undeserving of our attention.

Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

COLONIAL SOLICITORS BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF **HALSBURY** explained that this was a Bill to provide for the admission of solicitors of Courts of British Possessions to the Supreme Courts in the United Kingdom. That was the sole object of the Bill, and be hoped their Lordships would give it a Second Reading.

Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

LUNACY REGULATION (IRELAND) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

VOLUNTEERS BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (on re-commitment) (according to Order).

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

LORD **MONKSWELL** said that after the debate which took place on the Second Reading of the Bill* it would only be necessary for him to summarise in a very few words the objections that were then taken to the proposal of the noble Marquess that Volunteers should subject themselves beforehand to the liability of foreign service whenever the Secretary of State thought fit to ask for their services. It was pointed out on that occasion by the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition that in point of fact what the noble Marquess proposed to do by this clause was to turn a certain number of Volunteers into Army Reservists. In saying that, the noble Earl rather understated his case, because in the case of the Army Reservist certain circumstances had to occur before he could be called upon to rejoin the ranks, but according to this Bill the Volunteer was under the obligation to join the ranks and go to the front whenever the Secretary of State thought fit. The Volunteer, therefore, was in a worse position as regarded liability for foreign service than the ordinary Army Reservist. One objection which had been taken to the Bill was that it divided Volunteers into two perfectly distinct classes—namely, combatants and non-combatants He did not know whether he need labour the point as to the disadvantage of persons serving side by side as Volunteers in two different categories. The noble Marquess himself struck out the proviso that the Bill should only apply to Volunteers who entered after it had passed, on the ground that it was extremely undesirable that there should be two classes of Volunteers serving side by side. Another noble Lord (the Earl of Derby) mentioned the analogy of the Militia Reserve, and said that in his experience no friction whatever had arisen from Militia and Militia Reserve serving together. His information was entirely contrary. He was told that, in some battalions at all events, the Militia Reserve gave themselves perfectly intolerable airs of superiority, and that the *esprit de corps* to a certain extent suffered. One objection which he would urge had reference to recruits. It might very possibly be that public opinion would be in such a state that no young man would be able to join the Volunteers as a non-combatant, and therefore a number would probably refrain from joining at all. If the provisions of the Bill were carried into effect, the noble Marquess would not add one single willing recruit to the Army. Under present conditions a Volunteer who wanted to go to the front found it possible to do so. The noble Marquess said he wanted to know beforehand on how many men he could rely. But we did not generally send out Volunteers at the beginning of a campaign, and he should have thought that the noble Marquess would have had plenty of time to find out, when occasion arose, how many Volunteers he was likely to have at his disposal. It was impossible that the noble Marquess should know for certain on how many Volunteers he could rely, because a Volunteer could always get rid of his obligations at fourteen days notice. It had been said that a great many commanding officers of Volunteers had been consulted, and that they were mostly in favour of the change. There was, however, undoubtedly a great difference among commanding officers on this subject. He thought that in choosing a moment of popular excitement the Government had chosen a very unfortunate time for making a change in the constitution of the Volunteer forces.

---

* For Debate on Second Reading, see *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiii., page 1419. For proceedings in Committee, see page 577 of the present volume.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out 'to one or both of the following liabilities.'"—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): I understood that the noble Lord was prevented by accident from moving his Amendment when this Bill was passing through the Committee stage, and I therefore very readily recommitted it in order to give him an opportunity of raising the point in which he is interested. But I am bound to say that his Amendment does seem to me to be one which is directed at the principle of the Bill. I do not mean to say that there is nothing in the Bill but this clause. But this is by far the most important provision of the Bill, and those of your Lordships who did me the honour of listening to my statement when I introduced the measure can scarcely have failed to see that it was to this provision of the Bill above all the rest that I attached importance. We think it most necessary that Volunteers should have the power of entering beforehand into an agreement to serve on occasion beyond the limits of the United Kingdom. I am almost ashamed to repeat the argument which I have used before in this House, but I must again remind the House of the inconvenience to which the War Office was put, and to which the Volunteers themselves were put upon a recent occasion when, at the last moment, a considerable number of members of the force signified their desire to accept service in South Africa. We know that some, at all events, of the Volunteers are anxious and ready to accept this liability; we know that in a great number of cases the commanding officers of Volunteer corps do not object to the men under their command accepting the liability, and we know that the arrangement is one which will relieve the War Office of pressure at a moment when pressure is already heavy. With regard to the attitude of commanding officers of Volunteer corps I have only to say that when this Bill was first under consideration we took steps to consult a considerable number of Volunteer colonels in different parts of the kingdom, and we gathered from them that they are not opposed to the principle of the clause which the noble Earl wishes to omit. I have within the last few days again consulted a number of Volunteer officers connected with that well-known institution, the Institute of Commanding Officers of Volunteers, and from them also I gather that they are in favour of this provision, provided always that care is taken not to organise this class of Volunteers into separate companies within their corps, or to give them any outward mark by which they would be distinguished from their comrades in arms. I cannot help thinking that the apprehension expressed by the noble Lord opposite is somewhat exaggerated. We are told that if there are two classes of Volunteers there will be jealousy, and that those who do not accept the wider liability will be looked askance upon by their comrades. During the last few months we have seen the Yeomanry provide a certain number of men for service in South Africa, but is it the case that the other Yeomen who did not offer themselves as volunteers but remained at home have been looked askance upon by their comrades? I have heard nothing of the sort, and I do not believe it. It seems to me the most natural thing in the world that in a Volunteer corps there should be young men, unmarried and with, perhaps, no particular business occupation, who would be ready and glad to assume this liability, while their older comrades, perhaps married and settled down in life, with business ties, would not. I cannot conceive any practical inconvenience in establishing a distinction of that kind, and I sincerely trust that your Lordships, who I certainly understood accepted this provision when the Bill was read a second time, will not strike it out of the measure now.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I think I made it very plain indeed that I objected, and I confess I am not in the least convinced by the arguments used by the noble Marquess. My objection is not based by any means principally upon the jealousy which may exist, or upon any feeling which may be created in the corps, but is a much broader one. I object to turning the Volunteer force into what in point of fact will be a part of the Regular military forces of this country. It was always the intention that the Volunteers should be used for the defence of the country, and that their first duty was, when in an emergency the larger part of the effective Regular military forces had to be sent out of the country, to supply their place. I also feel that sufficient attention has not been drawn to another change in the Bill, to which I do not object, but which, taken in conjunction with this particular sub-section, seems to me to be likely to have a very undesirable effect. The Bill alters the conditions upon which we may call out the Volunteers. Formerly it was in the case of actual or apprehended invasion. For reasons which I think are good ones, the Government have determined to alter these words and substitute for them "of imminent national danger or of great emergency." I think the reason given was a sound one—that in a case of serious national emergency it might not be desirable to make a solemn statement to the whole world that we were of opinion that we were in imminent danger of invasion. It is better that the Government should be entrusted with the power of calling out Volunteers when in their opinion a serious emergency arises. The Government of the day will be the judge of what is a great emergency. I cannot help thinking that, if we have this second body of Volunteers always liable to be called on for foreign service, great emergencies will arise very frequently, owing to the Government not having foreseen those emergencies, and provided a proper military force for dealing with them, and they would then fall back on the Volunteer force at a time when it was impossible for anybody to object to it. As regards the by no means weighty argument upon which the Government chiefly rely for this change—namely, the advantage of knowing how many Volunteers are likely to be available, it seems to me that it cannot be put in the balance against the many disadvantages there are in the clause. It is not, I suppose, the intention of the Government to rely in ordinary cases upon the Volunteer force. What I imagine is intended is this: that when an emergency has arisen, and the force required, as was the case in South Africa, is found to be far larger than the Government had calculated upon, the Government will avail themselves of the service of the Volunteers. But there ought not to be any immediate and pressing emergency so great that there is not time to find out whether the Volunteers will come forward or not. I have no doubt that at a time of real national emergency Volunteers will be willing to come forward, and that we shall get them just as well as by means of this Bill. Indeed, I think the Bill would limit the number of men who would engage, because the men who had not engaged themselves to go abroad would feel somewhat relieved from the obligation to lend their aid. I see no possible advantage in the clause, but I see very serious disadvantages in it, and I object to it mainly on the ground that it is an attempt permanently to supply the deficiencies of our military system by enrolling a number of Volunteers for foreign service.

LORD HENEAGE asked whether the Volunteers who were to be liable to be called out would still remain a part of the regiment to which they were attached, or would be supernumerary. If they were to remain on the strength of the regiment, the Volunteers, when these men were called out, would be in the same position as the Militia had been during the past six months—they would be deprived of a large portion of their very best men at a time when they were most wanted.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I do not think it would be possible to decide beforehand that these men should be supernumerary to the establishment. That would mean that the moment, let us say, fifty men in a corps accepted liability, the corps would have to raise another fifty men to take their place. I am under the belief, from what I have heard, that it would be distasteful to the Volunteer corps themselves that these men should be created into a sort of caste outside the organisation of the corps.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause,"

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 67; Not-Contents, 27.

CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)
Cross, V. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Argyll, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.

Carlisle, E.
Cawdor, E.
Coventry, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Dartrey, E.
de Montalt, E.
Denbigh, E.
Egerton, E.
Haddington, E.
Harewood, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lindsey, E.
Mar, E.
Mayo, E.
Onslow, E.

Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Temple, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Clancarty, V. (*E. Clancarty.*)
Hardinge, V.
Llandaff, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Frankfort de Montmorency, V.

Gloucester, L. Bp.

Alverstone, L.
Avebury, L.
Bagot, L.
Belper, L.
Blythswood, L.
Brampton, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Chaworth L. (*E. Meath.*)
Churchill, L. [*Teller.*]
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colchester, L.

Colville of Culross, L.
Crofton, L.
De Mauley, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Glenesk, L.
Harris, L.
Hood of Avalon, L.
James, L.
Lawrence, L.
Lindley, L.
Ludlow, L.
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway.*)
Mostyn, L.
Napier, L.
Norton, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Robertson, L.
Sherborne, L.
Sinclair L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Suffield, L.
Wimborne, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Grafton, D.
Sutherland, D.

Ripon, M.

Buckinghamshire, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carrington, E.
Kimberley, E.
Morley, E.
Spencer, E.

Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Burghclere, L.
Davey, L.
Hawkesbury, L.
Heneage, L.
Herries, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Leigh, L.
Manners of Haddon, L. (*M. Granby.*)

Monkswell, L. [*Teller.*]
Ribblesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Thring, L.
Tweedmouth, L.
Wandsworth, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wolverton, L.

Bill reported without further amendment. The Report of Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and in the Standing Committee to be received To-morrow.

MILITARY LANDS BILL [H.L.]

Amendments reported (according to Order).

LORD HENEAGE moved to omit from Clause 1, the words "or the council of any county or borough," his object being to make the cost of sites for Volunteer rifle ranges a charge upon the State, and not upon the rates. Those of their Lordships who were present on the occasion of the Second Reading* would recollect that the Earl of Northbrook adverted to this question and quoted the opinion of the County Councils Association. The noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War intervened, and stated that he was going to make a statement with regard to it at a further stage, upon which Lord Northbrook said he would reserve what he had to say until he had heard that statement. Unfortunately, Lord Northbrook was unable to be present when the Bill passed through Committee, and no statement was made. Consequently he (Lord Heneage) now brought the question forward. A resolution was passed unanimously by the County Councils Association to the effect that no charge for providing or equipping rifle ranges should fall upon the rates, but that it should be paid out of the general revenues of the country. The association were quite willing, however, that county councils should bear the cost of the necessary inquiries and preliminary negotiations; but they felt that this was a national matter, and that any cost incurred in purchasing and equipping ranges should be a national charge. He might be met by the argument that this was, after all, only a permissive Bill. In his opinion, this very considerably strengthened his position. As there was no actual obligation on county councils to provide the cost, if they declined, a rifle corps might be left without the range, and the Government had no responsibility in the matter, though it was an Imperial, not a local question.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiii., page 1433.

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 1, page 1, line 5, to leave out 'or the council of any county or borough.'" —(*Lord Heneage.*)

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords: I must express my regret that I disappointed my noble friend of an explanation which he evidently expected. On the occasion to which he refers I think he and I must have been in the position of Lord Chatham and Sir Richard Strachan—each was waiting on the other, and the result was nothing was said. There are, of course, two classes of ranges which we have to consider. There are the great central ranges created mainly in the interest of the regular forces, but to which we have contemplated that Volunteers should have facilities of access when necessary. Volunteers require such access for the purpose of practising at the longer distances, and also for collective firing, which they are very often unable to practise owing to the insufficient width of their own corps ranges. But Volunteers can earn the Capitation Grant without firing at any distance greater than 600 yards. Therefore, they are to a great extent sufficiently provided for by ranges of a less length than that which we provide at Salisbury Plain and other places. Upon these great central ranges we have lately spent £320,000, in addition to a large sum included in the purchase money of land on Salisbury Plain, where we are laying out a number of these ranges; and when the work is finished I am in hopes that every Volunteer corps will have a central range within reasonable distance. I do not mean to suggest that they will not have to travel by rail to any of them, but their travelling expenses will be paid. Then I pass to the other class of ranges—the local or corps ranges. There is no doubt that the original intention was that these ranges should be provided by the Volunteers themselves, assistance being given by the Government in the form of a capitation grant; but I readily admit that things have altered a great deal since that arrangement was first made—rifles carry further, the difficulty of obtaining sites is greater, and I have no doubt that inspection has become more strict. Therefore, it seems to us reasonable that we should at all events assist Volunteers in providing local corps ranges. We took last year in our Military Works Loans Act the sum of £40,000 to be spent for the purpose of assisting Volunteers in this way, and nearly the whole of that sum has been allocated. We have, generally speaking, given to corps a third or nearly a half of the sum of which they stood in need. But besides this £40,000, I have lately obtained from Her Majesty's Government consent to spend a further sum of £100,000 on local ranges, and we are now engaged in considering how that sum should be distributed. A Committee known as the Ranges Committee has been sitting for some time, and is in constant communication with the General Officers in command of districts. I am able to tell your Lordships that when this expenditure is completed, we shall have travelled a considerable distance towards supplying the Volunteer corps throughout the United Kingdom with range accommodation within easy reach of their own headquarters. If I may be permitted, I will read a paragraph from a recent Report of the Committee, which will explain the matter very clearly. The Committee say—

> "Apart from the London corps, the expenditure now proposed . . . . will complete the process of providing the Volunteer force with suitable range accommodation. In the past two or three years the Volunteers have spent large sums on ranges, and the fact that last year not a single Volunteer was excused firing his class for want of accommodation, is evidence that the difficulties experienced on the introduction of the new rifle have been

met to a considerable extent. It has, however, been necessary for the men in many corps to travel long distances and incur some expense, but with the provision of the ranges now in question this will be reduced to a minimum, and there should in future be no corps without suitable ranges within easy reach, not only of their headquarters, but even of detached companies."

I ought not to omit to explain that in the distribution of funds now going on we propose to include subventions to some corps who have already provided ranges at their own expense, but who have done so under circumstances which seem to us to justify us in to some extent recouping them for the sacrifices they have made. I now come to the question which the noble Lord desires to raise by his Amendment—the question of assistance from the rates. Your Lordships will have observed, from what I have already said, that we admit that the central ranges concern us wholly, and local or corps ranges only partially. If, in regard to the local ranges, we are to adopt this principle of co-operation, the question arises, by whom is the remainder of the money, of which the Government finds a part, to be provided? There are three sources from which, conceivably, it might be found. There are the funds of the corps, there are private benefactions and subscriptions, and, lastly, there are the rates. I frankly confess to your Lordships that our Bill is drawn in such a manner as not to preclude the possibility of assistance from the rates. That, I gather, is the point of difference between my noble friend and myself. I am not quite sure whether his Amendment effects his purpose, but he evidently desires to put it out of the power of local authorities to make any contribution from the pockets of the ratepayers for these military purposes. I should be very sorry to see the Amend ment adopted. The matter, of course, does not rest with us; it rests entirely with these local bodies, and if under certain circumstances they should think proper to give some assistance from the rates towards these objects, I do not see why we should, by Act of Parliament, prevent them from doing so. It is already the case that some of these local authorities are, of their own free will, finding money for the purpose of providing rifle ranges. I am aware that the local authority of Nottingham has provided a rifle range, for which, I believe, some rent is paid by the corps which have the use of it. Norwich and Warwick are desirous of giving assistance, and Yarmouth has done so, and, I believe, is in hopes of attracting large numbers of Volunteers into camp in the vicinity of the town, no doubt with the thought of the advantage which may possibly thereby accrue to the neighbourhood. My noble friend referred to Lord Northbrook's action in this matter, and I may perhaps be allowed to say one word as to the circumstances under which this clause found its way into the Bill. Early in the spring Lord Northbrook was good enough to communicate with me on the subject, and he sent me a memorandum in which it was set out that the County Councils Association had been acting in concert with a body which, I believe, is known as the County Volunteers Development Association. A Committee had been appointed, and Lord Northbrook sent me a copy of the Report of the Committee, to which his signature was attached, and of which he expressed himself, I understood, entirely in favour. The sixth paragraph of that Report runs thus—

> "The Committee suggest that power should be given to local authorities to spend money upon the erection of buildings upon lands held for military purposes, and to borrow money for that purpose. They believe that local authorities may be willing, in some cases, to charge this expenditure upon the rates."

It was upon the strength of that that we drafted our Bill, and we certainly thought we were on very firm ground. It is perfectly true that at a later stage we became aware of the resolution passed by the County Councils Association. It stated that—

> "The Association is of opinion that the expense of the provision and equipment of ranges for Volunteers should be provided by Parliament and not by the rates."

But the Committee expressed itself entirely favourable to the provisions of the Bill as drafted, and I certainly took the resolution of the association as merely indicating their decided opinion that this was a matter in which the Government was very distinctly concerned, and that they did not want to have the whole of the financial burden thrown upon the shoulders of the ratepayers. That was my interpretation of the resolution, and I cannot help thinking it was not an unreasonable one. The Amendment of my noble friend does not entirely effect his purpose because he leaves in the Bill the second clause, under which urban councils will have the power of borrowing money for the purchase of land for military purposes, and county councils already have, and have had for some time, this power. The main question is whether your Lordships should leave the Bill as it stands, or put into it words which would absolutely preclude these local bodies, some of whom, we believe, for excellent reasons, desire to assist rifle ranges out of the rates, from doing so. I would ask your Lordships to adhere to the Bill in its present form.

THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH agreed in the view that, this being a national and not a local question, funds for the provision of rifle ranges should be provided by the nation, and not by the localities. On behalf of the private donor, he hoped no more would be left to his patriotism, because he was almost squeezed dry. Perhaps the Secretary for War would lay down the conditions under which the grant of £100,000 would be allocated.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: So far as I have been able to ascertain, there is a very important consideration which militates against my noble friend's Amendment; it is that this power is now possessed and has been exercised by certain county councils. If that be so, of course the principle has been admitted. I dare say the noble Marquess, who is no doubt perfectly acquainted with the matter, will be kind enough to tell us what is the extent of the power of local authorities to contribute towards the provision of rifle ranges. My objection was merely a general one. My feeling was that it was highly undesirable to put any new charges on the rates. That is a very old question, and I am certainly not going to enter into a full discussion on so knotty a point. We have been promised a reform of local taxation, not only by this Government, but by many Governments, but the promise has never been fulfilled. What I am afraid of is that in the meantime charges on local rates will be heaped up more and more. This is not equitable to the payer of rates. The wealth of the country does not now consist as it largely did formerly, of real property. The value of real property has fallen very much, whereas the wealth of the country has increased enormously, and everyone must see that those who are not liable to pay rates on real property have as much interest in the defence of the country as those who are liable. I deprecate altogether the laying of one burden after another, not only for this purpose but for other national purposes, on local rates, when those burdens should be borne by the Imperial Exchequer.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH said the question of providing rifle ranges for London Volunteers in the neighbourhood of London was most important and pressing on account of the density of the population, the immense number of Volunteers in London, and the condition of many London Volunteer corps, which were not drawn from one part of London only, but scattered over the whole of London, and therefore found difficulty in getting to their ranges. The question of providing them with ranges near London was under the consideration of a committee of the London County Council. He hoped the Secretary for War would assure the House that the matter was seriously under the consideration of the War Office, and would give some idea what steps the Government intended to take.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said that as chairman of the county council of his county in Scotland he heard with pleasure the observations that fell from the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition. He agreed that the provision of rifle ranges should not be thrown on the rates. The British ratepayer was a long-suffering, asinine person, and often submitted to burdens "when he might kick up his heels and stop the whole thing."

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I will first answer the question of my noble friend Lord Dartmouth, who asked whether I was in a position to tell him anything with regard to the conditions upon which this further grant is likely to be distributed. One of the conditions is that we must be satisfied as to the title, and I think it possible we may also stipulate in some cases that corps of Yeomanry, if within easy reach, might be allowed facilities for using the range. But I am afraid it is impossible to state in detail the conditions insisted upon in each case, because our instructions to the Ranges Committee are to deal with each case on its merits. The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition asked whether I could enlighten him as to the powers already possessed by local authorities to acquire or hire lands for military purposes. I do not know whether I can give him an exhaustive statement on the matter, but I am able to tell him this much, that county councils have power to purchase land for military purposes under Clause 69 of the Local Government Act. Borough councils were given similar powers under the Military Lands Act of 1892, and the object of Clause 2 of this Bill is to extend the powers now exercisable by a borough council to the council of an urban district. With regard to the powers dealt with by Clause 1 the case is as follows. Although county and borough councils have the power to acquire land, they have no power to adapt it to military purposes, and in order to give them that power Clause 1 has been introduced into the Bill. Lord Tweedmouth may be assured that the case of the metropolitan Volunteers is not being lost sight of. We attach the greatest importance to providing them with suitable range accommodation. Although I would rather not, for reasons which he can easily imagine, enter into details, I am able to say that the matter is receiving attention at this moment, and we earnestly hope and believe that a well-conceived project will be devised, under which the metropolitan Volunteers will have facilities for rifle practice within reasonable distance of their headquarters. Great difficulties have to be encountered not only in the case of London, but also in the case of all large towns in Great Britain, but I trust we may be able gradually to surmount them.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

*THE EARL OF MEATH asked permission to move an Amendment which provided that, subject to the control of the Secretary of State for War, the members of cadet corps should be permitted to use, free of charge, lands provided out of the public purse for military purposes. He said this Amendment was a very humble one, and would not add to the expense of either the ratepayers or taxpayers. It was because he did not wish to see militarism introduced into this country that he desired to see the free citizens of England capable of bearing arms trained to arms in their youth. An evidence of the necessity of imparting military instruction to the youth of this country was given in a lecture the previous evening by Dr. Warre, whose whole life had been spent in the education of the young, and whose reputation as an educationist was of the highest. Dr. Warre said—

> "I can honestly say that I have never seen any of those effects produced which the bogey of militarism would fain have us think to be the natural results of such training. I have never seen any even of the keenest Volunteers made worse scholars, or worse boys, by submitting to the instruction and the discipline of the corps. I believe, on the contrary, that all boys who go through that discipline and instruction are the better for it, gaining by it an increase in the power of self-control, and still further, in the power of being useful to their country in their after life. On the other hand, I believe that the salvation of the country as regards national defence depends upon the right and timely training of its youth with reference to this special national need."

He hoped the noble Marquess would not lose the present opportunity, but would introduce a Bill before the end of the session dealing with the subject. It had been said that the training of our lads would not add one effective soldier to the battalions. That was quite true in one sense, but we had to look to the future, when these lads might prove of great service.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I will not say a word that could be interpreted as denoting any want of sympathy with the noble Earl's desire that the youth of this country should receive a reasonable amount of military education. I am well aware how great an interest he has taken in the question of cadet corps, and I wish him all possible success in the excellent work in which he interests himself. But I am afraid that it is quite impossible for me to accept this Amendment, a copy of which he handed to me just before the House met. I cannot help thinking that he has drawn his Amendment under a misconception of the scope and objects of the Bill. This is a Bill the object of which is to facilitate the acquisition of land for military purposes by certain local authorities, while the object of the Amendment is to secure that cadet corps shall have the free use of ranges acquired under the Military Lands Act of 1892 or under this Bill. That is really a question which does not arise at all on this occasion. This Bill does not raise the question of the conditions under which the different corps are to have the use of ranges, and I must say that I should hesitate, even if the clause really were germane to the Bill, to accept a proposal that these particular corps should be given a preferential use of ranges free of charge.

*THE EARL OF MEATH: Not a preferential use.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Preferential in the sense that they would use the ranges free of charge.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY): This Amendment is not on the Paper, and as your Lordships have not had an opportunity of reading and considering it, I do not think it should be put.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH pointed out that a Cadet corps would be able to obtain all the advantages desired by becoming attached to a Volunteer corps.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Unless I am very much mistaken, cadet corps are affiliated and attached to Volunteer corps.

LORD THRING: I understood the noble Marquess to undertake, in the Grand Committee, that if I would draw up a schedule setting out the procedure of the Bill, he would accept it. I spent the whole of yesterday afternoon drawing up a schedule, which is admitted by the War Office to be correct. I wish to know whether the noble Marquess will not bring it forward himself and allow it to pass.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Considerable trouble has been taken in order to meet, if possible, the wishes which have been expressed by the noble Lord who has just spoken and the noble Lord who sits behind him for some clear statement of the procedure which will be followed under this Bill in cases of the compulsory acquisition of land. The noble and learned Lord has been good enough to draft a schedule, which I have considered, and I must put it to the House whether it really will be for the public convenience that we should incorporate that schedule in the Bill. Several courses have been suggested to us with the object of explaining to the public what this procedure is to be. It was suggested, I think at first by Lord Monkswell, that we might print in the schedule of the Bill the different clauses to which reference is made in the Bill itself. It was found that that was virtually impossible owing to the number and length of the clauses. I am afraid, therefore, that that alternative has to be dismissed. Then we come to the noble and learned Lord's proposal that the schedule which he has been good enough to send to me should be printed as part of the Bill. It gives a full description of the procedure to be adopted under the Lands Clauses Acts, under the Allotments Act of 1887, and under the Local Government Act of 1894. It is a somewhat lengthy paper, and there is this to be remembered, that if we were to insert it in the Bill it would not be a full and complete account of the new procedure, because there would still be in the background the adaptation which the Local Government Board is empowered to make in applying the clauses under which allotments may be purchased to the purchase of land for rifle ranges. Moreover, I doubt whether it is convenient to insert a statement which professes to be a complete account of other statutes, but which is worded in terms different from those used in the statutes. I think such a procedure is open to grave objection. I would venture to suggest to the noble and learned Lord and to your Lordships that we may fairly meet the objections that have been raised by the procedure contemplated by the Bill—namely, that the Local Government Board should, in the usual way, make the Adapting Order under this Bill, which Adapting Order will be published. I am told that in this case the Adapting Order will be published during the coming autumn. If this is not considered sufficient I should be willing to have a concise statement of the procedure printed and published, but I prefer not to have it in the Bill. I trust the alternative I have proposed will be acceptable to the noble and learned Lord and to the House.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: The noble Marquess has, I think, endeavoured to meet the noble and learned Lord to a certain extent, but I confess that the more I hear of it the more unsatisfactory the arrangement seems to be. In point of fact the matter appears to be so complicated that it is impossible to draw up any statement sufficiently clear to be put into the Bill. If that is so, is it not rather hard that people whose property is to be taken against their will should not know the procedure under which that is to be done? Although I think it is quite right that there should be power to take land compulsorily under this Bill, that power ought only to be exercised under plain, distinct, and statutory regulations. There is a very elastic power lodged in the Local Government Board, and I must say that I am jealous of the Executive having any power to deal peremptorily with the property of other people. The power should be fenced round and distinctly set out, so that no one can feel that he has any ground for complaint as to the manner in which it has been exercised.

LORD MONKSWELL said that his noble and learned friend Lord Thring was very much exercised in his mind as to the word "adaptation," which he considered very vague and not at all desirable.

THE EARL OF MORLEY said that in his opinion the wording of Section 2 of Clause 3 was anything but satisfactory. The section stated that the provisions of Sections 9 and 10 of the Local Government Act, 1894, and of the enactments thereby incorporated, should, as far as they were applicable, and subject to such adaptations as the Local Government Board might by order prescribe, apply in the case of hiring land compulsorily for military purposes as they applied in the case of hiring land compulsorily for allotments. He suggested that the noble Marquess should state definitely in the Bill how many of the provisions of Sections 9 and 10 of the Local Government Act, 1894, were applicable, and that the "adaptations" of the Local Government Board should be abolished.

Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow.

ANCIENT MONUMENTS PROTECTION BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow.

RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to Order); Amendments made; Bills passed, and sent to the Commons.

POOR REMOVAL BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1:—

*LORD AVEBURY said he had been requested by the Association of Poor Law Unions of England and Wales to move what seemed a very reasonable Amendment to this clause. The clause provided that—

> "A person who has resided continuously for five years in England shall not thereafter be removed to Ireland under the Acts relating to the relief of the poor."

He proposed to insert after the word "England" the words "of which five years not less than one year shall have been continuously in the parish or union in which he applies for relief." He believed he was correct in saying that the restriction as he proposed to amend it was the law in regard to Scottish removals. The object of the Amendment was also to secure that there should be some evidence that the person in question had been for five years in England.

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 1, line 2, after ('England') to insert ('of which five years not less than one year shall have been continuously in the parish or union in which he applies for relief.'")—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*LORD HARRIS: My instructions from the Local Government Board are to ask your Lordships not to accept this Amendment. The object of the Bill is to redress what is regarded as a grievance in Ireland. At present there is no law of settlement in Ireland, and a person who has been born in England but who obtains relief from the rates in Ireland is not removable to England, whereas the Irish born person if he comes upon the rates in England can, except under two circumstances, be removed back to Ireland. It has long been felt in Ireland that this is a serious grievance. The two circumstances under which an Irish born person living in England becomes what is called irremovable are where he has, in the first case, lived for three years continuously in a parish, in which case he obtains a settlement in that parish; and, secondly, where he has lived continuously for a year in the union in which he applies for relief, and that year has to be immediately antecedent to the date on which he applies for relief. In either of these cases he becomes irremovable, but unless he has resided three years continuously in a parish, or if he applies for relief outside the union in which he has lived continuously for a year, he is still removable back to Ireland, whereas under no circumstances is an English born person obtaining relief from the rates in Ireland removable back to England. The effect of the noble Lord's Amendment would, in the opinion of the Local Government Board, really be to stultify the Bill. If a person can be shown to have lived for five years in England, he then obtains a settlement in England, and cannot be removed back to Ireland; but the noble Lord proposes to cut down that advantage, as it is regarded in Ireland, by making it compulsory upon the person to have lived for a year in the parish or union in which he applies for relief. This Amendment would prevent the advantage being conferred which we have endeavoured to give to Ireland, by increasing the possibility of removability. That is the reason why I ask your Lordships to reject the Amendment.

Lord CLONBROCK said that as an old Irish Poor Law Guardian he could testify to the fact that the grievance which this Bill proposed to remove had been actually felt for many years in Ireland. Any person who became destitute in Ireland had to be relieved, utterly irrespective of whether he was born in Ireland or had lived there any number of years. It might happen that a person who had only been in Ireland one day applied for relief, in which case the union would have to maintain him if necessary for the whole course of his life. On the other hand he had known cases of Irishmen being sent back from England after an absence from their own country of twenty years.

Earl SPENCER: I sincerely trust that the Bill will be carried in its present form. I have every reason to recollect, during the considerable number of years I was in Ireland, that continual cases of this kind were cropping up. It is a very great and serious complaint, and, as I understand it, the Bill as it is framed is a Bill of reciprocity. It puts Englishmen in Ireland on exactly the same footing as Irishmen in England with regard to removability under the poor law.

***Lord AVEBURY** said he did not oppose the Bill. The object of his Amendment simply was to secure that a person should have been living for a reasonable time in a union before he became chargeable to the union. To omit this was practically to abolish the law of settlement.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

***Lord AVEBURY** then moved the insertion of a new clause, the object of which was to secure that proper evidence should be obtained in corroboration of the statement of the pauper. This provision was required as between one union in England and another union in England, and the safeguards which were considered necessary in England should be applicable in this case. Unless some such words were inserted there would be nothing on which the magistrates could act except the mere statement of the pauper himself. Surely it was reasonable that some evidence in corroboration of that statement should be allowed to be insisted upon.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 1 to insert as a new clause: 'Upon an application for removal of a pauper to Ireland, the justices or magistrates hearing such application shall, if the pauper shall assert that he has resided continuously in England for five years without relief require such evidence in corroboration of such assertion to be furnished as they or he may deem sufficient, and in the event of no satisfactory evidence in corroboration being furnished, or on being satisfied that the board of guardians applying for the order of removal has made proper enquiries but has failed to obtain such corroborative evidence as aforesaid, such justices or magistrates shall make such order as they or he would have made had this Act not been passed."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

***Lord HARRIS**: I fear that I appear in a very unsympathetic attitude towards the noble Lord, but I am instructed to oppose the insertion of this new clause. The object of the noble Lord's Amendment is to throw the onus of proof upon the pauper. We will take the case of an Irish pauper whom the guardians wish to remove, and who objects to being removed. The noble Lord wished to throw upon the pauper the onus of proving that he has been resident in England for five years. Apart from the question whether the pauper is in a very good position to produce corroborative evidence before the justices, the guardians are not, as a matter of fact, by this Bill put in a different position from what they are under the present Act. Under the Act at present the onus of proof is thrown upon the guardians who wish to remove a pauper, and I think one is justified in assuming that, whoever has to produce the evidence, the justices will require sufficient proof before they consent to an order for removal. Of course it is obvious that the obtaining of evidence sufficient to satisfy the justices will be a matter of labour and of some expense. It is quite likely, if the noble Lord's Amendment was adopted, that the guardians would still be put to labour and expense, because they would have to satisfy themselves that the pauper's statement and such corroborative evidence as he managed to adduce, which might or might not be very credible, were in fact true. The Bill does not throw upon the guardians an onus which does not rest upon them now. The Local Government Board, having given careful and sympathetic attention to the representations of the very important body the noble Lord represents, are of opinion that the Bill as it was introduced by your Lordships is, upon the whole, in the best form.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY did not see that there could be any hardship under the Bill as it stood.

LORD CLONBROCK ventured to think that it would be impossible for a pauper to prove that he had resided continuously in England for five years without receiving relief, unless he subpœnaed all the relieving officers in the country.

*LORD AVEBURY said he had been informed that all that the Amendment asked was that the same precautions should be taken in the case of the removal of Irish paupers as were taken when English paupers were removed from one parish to another After what had been said, however, he could not press his Amendment, but he hoped Her Majesty's Government would look into the point raised.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Bill reported, without amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

UNION OF BENEFICES ACT, 1860, AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIABILITY OF SHIPOWNERS AND OTHERS) BILL [No. 138].

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) EXTENSION BILL [No. 139].

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and to be printed.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — BOER PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA.

THE EARL OF MAYO: I beg to ask Her Majesty's Government whether it is a fact that the Boer prisoners at St. Helena are being fed with fresh, while our soldiers guarding them only get tinned, meat; and whether the cleaning out of the tents occupied by the Boer prisoners is done by our fatigue parties.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am glad to be able to reassure my noble friend. I have to-day received from the officer commanding troops at St. Helena the following telegram—

> "It is not true that prisoners of war at St. Helena are being fed with fresh, while our soldiers guarding them only get tinned, meat. Meat ration same in each case. Prisoners of war clean out their own tents and ground occupied by them. Prisoners of war clean also remainder."

I do not know what "remainder" is.

> "No fatigue parties of our soldiers are used for these purposes."

House adjourned at half past Seven of the clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 28*th June*, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LONDON (CLERKENWELL AND HOLBORN) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said this was a Bill confirming an improvement scheme under the Housing Act of 1890, to be carried out by the London County Council. The areas dealt with by the scheme were in the neighbourhood of Holborn, and the number of persons of the working classes who would be displaced by the scheme was about 1,400. The Bill provided that new dwellings for the accommodation of at least 1,400 persons should be erected on the area, but there was no stipulation that the new accommodation, or any quota of it, should be provided before the old dwellings were demolished. His object in moving in the matter was to repair that defect in the Bill, and should he be successful he proposed to take the same course with regard to three other precisely similar London Bills which were on the Paper that day. He would like to say at the outset how cordially he recognised the good work done by the London County Council with regard to the housing of the people, bearing in mind the limited powers which the Legislature had conferred upon that body. They were now in a position to review by the light of experience what had been accomplished, and he thought it could not be denied that in certain respects the results were disappointing. It was due to the London County Council to say that it had removed a certain number of plague spots; but, on the other hand, some of their beneficent schemes had been attended by the most deplorable incident that, in securing the removal of existing slums, they had assisted in the creation of new ones in the immediate neighbourhood. Existing buildings had been demolished before new accommodation had been supplied, and there had been a long period between the displacement of the old population and the provision of new buildings. Meanwhile great hardship had been inflicted upon the poor inhabitants, who had been compelled to seek shelter elsewhere, with the result that the terrible problem of overcrowding had been intensified in the district surrounding the improved area. An experience in his own constituency had made him painfully familiar with these results. It had been stated by the chief sanitary inspector for Bethnal Green that the result of the Boundary Street scheme was to turn 3,000 persons into other crowded parts of his district. [MR. COLLINGS dissented.] Well, he would not bind himself to that exact figure, but that was substantially the number, and he was in a position personally to corroborate the statement. No doubt the fine buildings which were opened in Bethnal Green the other day by the Prince of Wales constituted a great achievement, but it was worthy of note that they were not occupied by the displaced inhabitants, and that to a very large extent they were not occupied by Bethnal Green people at all. They had been let to persons coming from all parts of London, and even from outside the metropolis. He was surprised to find, indeed, that persons who had previously removed their families some miles outside London had come back to Bethnal Green, because they preferred the substantially-built sanitary dwellings of the London County Council to the jerry-built structures of the speculating builder at Walthamstow or Leytonstone. Now, his object was to prevent the experience of his constituents in Bethnal Green being repeated in other parts of London. He understood it would be quite possible to acquire a site available for the erection of a considerable number of dwellings before demolishing any of those which now existed. They knew what had been the policy of the Local Government Board in these matters, and he desired to see that policy adopted by the Home Office, which was the confirming authority as regarded these schemes so far as London was concerned. The Local Government Board was the confirming authority for improvement schemes outside the metropolis, and he found that when such schemes were brought forward for provincial towns the

Local Government Board invariably introduced into the Order a clause similar to that which he desired to impose upon the London schemes. Perhaps the House would permit him for a moment to sketch out the general framework of what he might call the model clause approved by the Local Government Board. [The hon. Member read the model clause.] The House would see that, according to this model clause, provision was made that the demolition of the existing buildings should proceed *pari passu* with the provision of new dwellings for the accommodation of the persons displaced by the scheme. He wished to press this as strongly as he could upon the attention of the representative of the Home Office, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley would consent to the postponement of the motion for the Third Reading of this Order, and put himself into communication with the London County Council, so that, by friendly concert between the two authorities some clause framed on the lines he had indicated might be introduced into this and the other Bills they had to consider that day. There could be no difficulty in carrying it out in the case of the Poplar scheme, because there the new dwellings were to be erected, not on the insanitary area itself, but on land in the neighbourhood. Perhaps the more convenient plan for him to adopt would be to move the adjournment of the debate, but he would not do so then, as the effect would only be to restrict the area of discussion. It might, however, be moved later on, and so for the present he would content himself with expressing a sincere hope that the right hon. Gentleman would give to the point he had raised the careful consideration he thought it deserved.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley) said he would like to point out to the hon. Member that the postponement of the Third Reading of this Order would delay the scheme for replacing insanitary dwellings by healthy ones, and he did not think the improvement should be put off longer than was absolutely necessary. As to the Home Office entering into communication with the London County Council on the question, he could assure the hon. Member that they were so acting at the present time. If the hon. Member would only look at the Provisional Orders before the House he would find that they were so worded as to give the Secretary of State complete control over the demolition of houses and the building of other houses for the re-housing of the people. That provision was inserted with the express purpose of securing that, so far as was possible, the new accommodation should be provided before the demolition took place. And this was no perfunctory policy on the part of the Department; it was carried out in regard to almost every scheme, and the Home Office was in continual communication with the London County Council in order to secure that end. It was the case that the London County Council were quite willing to co-operate with the Home Office in doing all that was possible in that direction. But in some cases it was physically impossible to carry out such an arrangement; and if the hon. Member would only favour him by examining the details which he would be pleased to hand to him, he would be astonished at the steps the Home Office were taking, in co-operation with the London County Council, to progress in the direction which he desired. It was the case that in most of the schemes which came before the Local Government Board clauses were put in which were far more stringent than the model clause quoted by the hon. Member. But then the cases were entirely different. The provincial Orders dealt with the displacement of far smaller numbers of people than did the metropolitan schemes, and he ventured to assert that there was scarcely a case coming from a provincial town where accommodation could not at once be obtained by the persons displaced. The same could not be said of these great London schemes. With regard to the Poplar scheme 269 people were to be displaced. They were now resident in three small areas, and fortunately the London County Council possessed a vacant area in the neighbourhood upon which they were quite willing to erect houses before demolishing the other buildings. At St. Luke's about 1,000 people were to be displaced. There, however, there were four areas to be dealt with. In the case of one the houses would be destroyed, and fresh ones would be put up before the second area was touched. The same remark applied to Southwark. He thought the hon. Member was singularly unfortunate in selecting the Boundary Street scheme as an instance of the necessity for carrying out his proposal, for he believed it was arranged to divide that scheme into five or six sections, and to complete one section before commencing on another.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes; the original design was admirable, but it was not carried out; and, as a matter of fact, the whole of the area was cleared for a year before a single new building was erected.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said he did not think the hon. Gentleman was quite right in his statement of fact, although he was aware that the original design was modified. He could only repeat that if the hon. Member insisted upon the insertion in the London schemes of a clause of the nature he had indicated the result would probably be to indefinitely delay large metropolitan schemes for rehousing the people. He would point out, further, that the object aimed at was very largely secured under the agreement which had been come to in respect of these four particular schemes, and he hoped, therefore, that the opposition to the Third Reading of the Bill would not be pressed.

Mr. COHEN (Islington, E.) said he only desired to affirm, as regarded the London County Council, what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman—namely, that there had been the most absolute co-operation between the Home Office and the London County Council. It was quite true that the London County Council was subject to the control of the Home Office, but it was equally the fact, and that had been acknowledged by his right hon. friend, that they had not sought in any way to obstruct the Home Office or to diminish the obligations incumbent upon them. No doubt, in some cases they had been obliged to demolish old houses before they could put up new ones; but then it was clear that where they only had the one site available it must be cleared before the new building could be erected. He fully sympathised with the object of the hon Member for South-west Bethnal Green, but he ventured to suggest that if this opposition were persisted in it would retard, if not altogether frustrate, the object which they all had in view.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: For the present I will content myself with the assurances I have received that the Home Office will carefully watch this matter, and secure, as far as possible, that no existing dwellings shall be demolished until new ones have been provided.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—

Walsall Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

BIRMINGHAM CORPORATION (STOCK) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

SCOTTISH AMERICAN INVESTMENT COMPANY BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER.)

Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

SOUTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL. [Lords].

As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

LONDON (POPLAR) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Read the third time, and passed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

LONDON (ST. LUKE) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL. (BY ORDER).

LONDON (SOUTHWARK) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL. (BY ORDER).

Read a second time, and committed.

BARRY RAILWAY (STEAM VESSELS) BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings given before the Committee on the Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill, 1898, be referred to the Committee on the above-named Bill.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MUIRKIRK, MAUCHLINE, AND DALMELLINGTON RAILWAYS (ABANDONMENT) BILL [Lords].

Report [26th June] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

ELECTRIC POWER BILLS.

Sir JAMES KITSON reported from the Select Committee on Electric Power Bills, That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL AND CLONTARF URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL (JOINT COMMITTEE.)

Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH reported from the Joint Committee on the Dublin Corporation Bill and the Clontarf Urban District Council Bill, That the parties opposing the Dublin Corporation Bill had stated that the evidence of George N. M'Murdo, chief clerk of the Irish Lights Commissioners, 94, Rathgar Road, Dublin, and James W. Drúry, Local Government Board auditor, Albany Lodge, Monkstown, county Dublin, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that their attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said George N. M'Murdo and James W. Drury do attend the said Committee on Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock, and remain in attendance during the proceedings of the Committee.

Ordered, That George N. M'Murdo and James W. Drury do attend the Joint Committee on the Dublin Corporation Bill and the Clontarf Urban District Council Bill on Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock, and remain in attendance during the proceedings of the Committee.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP D).

Mr. HARGREAVES BROWN reported from the Committee on Group D of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill, without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to East Surrey Water, Hayling Water, Maidenhead Water, Sevenoaks Water, South-West Suburban Water, and Tonbridge Water." Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Corporation of Manchester to construct additional tramways in and near the city, and to confer further powers upon the Corporation and neighbouring authorities in respect of tramways within and beyond the city; and for other purposes." Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 271.]

MANCHESTER CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

COLONIAL MARRIAGES (DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER) BILL.

Petition of the Agents General for the Cape, Natal, New Zealand, Tasmania, and the Australian Colonies, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS).

Petition from Milford Haven, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Margate, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL, AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Petition from Milford Haven, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Hambleden; Fulham; Marylebone; Watford; Westminster; Shepherd's Bush; Grosvenor Square; Oxford Street (two); Bristol (three); Chelsea (two); Glyncorrwg; Ayr; Fowlmere; Stafford; Stoke-upon-Trent; Wakefield; Scramerston; Norham; Renishaw; Bunhill Fields; Coventry; Tweedmouth; Rugby; Llanarthney; South Bristol; Hull (three); Radcliffe (two); Wolverhampton; Wykefield; Mossley; West Cornforth; Kelloe; New Malden; Dukinfield: Stalybridge (three); Sheffield; Hexham; and Wigan; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Watchfield; Harringay; Hinckley; New Whittington; Renishaw; Coventry; Llanarthney; Stalybridge (two); Corbridge; Ramsgate; Margate; Dukinfield; Bassaleg; Mynyddislwyn; Newport (Mon.); West Cornforth; Kelloe; Weston-super-Mare; Bristol; Abbey Road; Redditch; Lancaster; Heath Town; and Wigan; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Llanarthney, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR (HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION).

Copy presented, of Telegrams respecting Hospital Accommodation for the Troops in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS).

Copy presented, of Administration Report on the Railways in India in 1899–1900, by F. R. Upcott, esquire, C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, Railways [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Draft Order in Council constituting a Consultative Committee of the Board of Education [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Eighteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1899. Part III. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of General Rules for the government of the Asylum situated at Kirklands, in the county of Lanark [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2463 to 2467 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 530 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900-1901).

Copy presented, of Supplementary Estimate of the additional amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1901 for expenditure in respect of Army Medical Establishments [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 240.]

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — HOSPITAL ARRANGEMENTS AT THE FRONT—MR. BURDETT-COUTTS' CHARGES.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I beg to give notice that on an early day I will call attention to the military hospital arrangements in South Africa and move a resolution. I also give notice that I will call attention on, I hope, an earlier day to the inconvenient operation of Standing Order 17, and move to add at the end of the clause—"No notice of motion or order of the day shall prevent any such motion from being proceeded with." I shall further ask the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House whether, having regard to the fact——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must point out to the right hon. Gentleman that he has given notice of a motion which he is precluded from moving. He has already on the Notice Paper a motion which raises practically the same question as that raised by the second motion of which he has now given notice. Notice of a question must be given in the usual way.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I will do that, Sir.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the letter of the honourable Member for Westminster, from Cape Town, dated 29th May, on our wars and our wounded; whether the previous letters, written from Bloemfontein early in April, but not published, were communicated by the same hon. Member or any other person to the War Office on their receipt; and, if so, what steps were taken by the War Office to inquire into the condition of the hospitals and the sick in Bloemfontein and other hospital centres; and whether the Government are now in a position to make any satisfactory statement as to the condition of the hospitals and the treatment of the sick in Bloemfontein in the months of April and May last, and generally in South Africa.

The following questions on the same subject also appeared on the Paper—:

MR. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland): To ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the allegations concerning the hospital arrangements and equipment in South Africa; what steps are being or will be taken to inquire into and report upon the subject; and who is the official of the War Office directly responsible to the Secretary of State for the sufficiency and efficiency of the provision made for the treatment of sick and wounded on active service.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, in consequence of the public statement made by a Member of this House yesterday with regard to the treatment of the sick and wounded in South Africa, he will cause an immediate inquiry into the allegations made.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Under Secretary for War whether, in view of the charges brought against the medical arrangements for the troops in South Africa, he is prepared to make any statement upon this matter.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I have read the letter of the hon. Member for Westminster. No previous communication has, so far as I know, reached the War Office beyond the short telegram sent to the Commander-in-Chief from Cape Town on June 1st. There are six questions on the Paper arising out of the statements made by the hon. Member, and I understand that my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury will be prepared to deal with them in reply to a question which stands last on the Paper in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DILLON: Arising out of that answer, perhaps I may be permitted to ask the hon. Gentleman to reply to the paragraph in my question which asks whether the letters of the hon. Member for Westminster previous to 29th May came to the knowledge of the War Office through any channel?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I have answered that we had no previous communication from the hon. Member at the War Office beyond the telegram of 1st June.

MR. DILLON: The reason that I ask the question is that the answer of the hon. Member to my question just now was not an answer. My question was perfectly distinct. It was whether the communication I have alluded to and what may be described as the suppressed letters of the hon. Member for Westminster—["No!"]—suppressed, I mean, by *The Times* newspaper, not by the Government—whether these letters did come to the knowledge of the War Office through any channel. The hon. Gentleman's answer was that he had had no communication from the hon. Member for Westminster.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I know nothing of the letters which *The Times* newspaper declined to publish.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to a letter from Cape Town dated 29th May last, signed by the hon. Member for Westminster, in which grave defects are described as having existed in the treatment of the sick in South Africa; whether Her Majesty's Government are aware of the facts as described; who is responsible for the state of things alleged; and whether prompt steps have been taken to remedy it.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think it is perhaps for the convenience of the House that I should endeavour to answer in one reply the numerous questions on what most naturally and properly is felt by the House to be a subject of national importance. I do not understand that anything has come to our notice which suggests that any sufferings of the sick and wounded in South Africa are due to an insufficient supply of medical appliances and comforts sent from this country. The question is rather one of organisation and distribution in South Africa. A certain amount of correspondence, which I hold in my hand, has passed between Lord Roberts and the Secretary of State on the subject, and I propose to lay this correspondence before the House. I hope it will be in the hands of Members in a very few hours—probably before dinner-time this evening. But as the House is feeling so keenly on the subject, perhaps hon. Members will like me to read some material extracts from this correspondence, even if those extracts somewhat exceed in length an ordinary answer to a question in this House. As my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War has stated, the first intimation reached us in a telegram to the Commander-in-Chief from the hon. Member for Westminster on the 4th of June. On the 5th of June the Secretary of State telegraphed to Lord Roberts, and on the 6th of June Lord Roberts sent the reply, which will soon be in the hands of Members, and from which the following extracts are taken—

"The very existence of my force depended upon the supplies coming up by train along a line of railway nearly 900 miles long, every bridge of which for the last 128 miles had been destroyed by the enemy. Notwithstanding this, I ordered that the requirements of the sick were to be first taken in hand as soon as the rail had been repaired and a few trains of supplies had been got through. The principal medical officer proceeded with the first train to Kroonstad with surgeons and nurses. The field hospital could not be utilised, as we were about to move on again, but No. 3 general and Scotch hospital had been held in readiness at Bloemfontein to be sent to Kroonstad directly the line was open; this was done, and the former received 180 patients within twenty-four hours of its arrival. I repeatedly visited the hospitals during the short time I was at Kroonstad, and I impressed upon the principal medical officer and Lord Methuen, who was on his way to Kroonstad, to do all that was possible to remedy matters. A few days after my departure I received a report from the principal medical officer that the medical arrangements there were in all respects in good order, while Lord Methuen has since informed me that everything is thoroughly satisfactory. I was deeply distressed at being unable to make suitable arrangements for the sick on our first arrival at Kroonstad; but it is obvious that a certain amount of suffering is inseparable from the rapid advance of a large army in the enemy's country, when railway communication has been destroyed; and such suffering would have been enormously increased had it not been for the prompt manner in which the medical authorities made the best of the very scanty accommodation available at a place little larger than an ordinary English village."

Subsequent to that reply of Lord Roberts a further communication was addressed on the same subject by the Secretary for War to the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa on 20th June. On 25th June a reply was sent by Lord Roberts, of which I propose to read this extract—

"As regards hospitals at the base, before leaving Cape Town I personally assured myself that the arrangements were working satisfactorily, and I have not heard since any complaints about them. When we arrived at Bloemfontein we had an abnormal number of sick, due no doubt not only to the peculiarly exhausting nature of the march, but also to the terrible insanitary conditions of our camp at Paardeberg, where the only water available for drinking purposes flowed down from the Boer camp a mile and a-half higher up the river, which was crowded with dead animals in a state of decomposition. We also had a considerable number of wounded after the fight on the 10th of March. To hastily improvise accommodation at Bloemfontein for such a large number, which gradually increased up to 2,000 before I left that town, was no easy task. Owing to the rapidity of our march from the Modder no tents could be carried with the force, and none were available until our railway communication with Cape Colony had been restored. As soon as I could arrange for such supplies being placed at Bloemfontein as were necessary for the very existence of the force, I ordered up tents and all necessary appliances for the sick, nurses, more doctors, and more hospitals. Bloemfontein is not a large town, but all suitable public buildings, schools, etc., were made into hospitals. I constantly visited these, and after a very short time they were, I considered, in good order and not overcrowded. . . . . I can quite understand that people who have no practical experience in such matters are much concerned to hear the hardships which sick and wounded soldiers have to undergo in time of war, especially when they are not aware of the many difficulties that have to be contended with in order to alleviate suffering on active service. Such difficulties are sufficiently great in countries in which there are large towns and villages, and easy communication by road and rail from the base of operations, but they have been immeasurably increased in South Africa by the local conditions to which I have already referred. I have no wish to shirk responsibility in the matter or to screen any shortcomings which might be proved against the Royal Army Medical Corps. You state you have been told that the reports of MacCormac and Treves are optimistic, and the conditions have probably changed for the worse since their visit. It is true that neither of these gentlemen took part in any long or difficult march, but two consulting surgeons who are now *en route* to England—Mr. Watson Cheyne and Mr. Lenthal-Cheatle—have been with this force from the Modder River to Pretoria. I would ask that their opinions on the subject might be ascertained, and I would further suggest that a small committee, consisting of one or two medical men of recognised ability in whom the public have full confidence, together with some men of sound common sense, should be deputed to proceed to South Africa in order to inquire into and furnish a full report on the working of the medical arrangements throughout the war. I will guarantee that they shall have the fullest assistance to enable them to make a searching inquiry into the matter. If their visit should result in ameliorating the conditions of our sick and wounded soldiers during time of war, no one would be more grateful and pleased than myself."

The Government are of opinion that some such independent inquiry should, at Lord Roberts's request, be placed at his disposal. I think the House has as full information as can be given until hon. Members have the Papers in their hands. The subject, I am aware, is one on which a great deal of public feeling is properly excited, and, in my opinion, where such a state of public feeling exists, it is most desirable that this House should have an opportunity of discussing the question if it so desires. I do not think that a motion for the adjournment of the House would be a convenient method, because the Papers would not be in the hands of Members. In any case, my right hon. friend the Member for the Isle of Thanet has put down what is called a blocking notice, which would prevent the adjournment of the House from being moved. [HON. MEMBERS: No, no!] I am so informed; but, however that may be, I think that a far more orderly procedure would be for the House to discuss this question on the Estimates. I propose to-morrow, therefore, that we should depart from the announced order of business, and place an Estimate first on the Paper before the Scotch Votes, to enable the question to be raised. I had originally intended to place on the Paper the Vote for the salary of the Secretary of State, but I have reason to believe that under our rules it would not be possible to discuss the Medical Department on that Vote, because there is a separate Vote for it. I propose, therefore, to place a purely nominal Supplementary Estimate of £5 for the Army Medical Department, to stand first on the Order Paper, in order to give the House the opportunity of discussing this question. I hope the House will feel that I have given all the information I can with a view to publicity.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman a question arising out of his answer—whether in Lord Roberts's statement there is any account of the field hospitals about Bloemfontein—any account other than that which he has read of the town hospitals within Bloemfontein, which contained 700 patients out of 2,200? I did not hear them referred to.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I venture to think that we had better not attempt to anticipate the debate of to-morrow by question and answer across the floor of the House. It is a legitimate question, but it can be dealt with adequately to-morrow.

WAR FUNDS COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state what steps the Government intend taking to give effect to the recommendations of the War Funds Committee presided over by Lord Justice Henn Collins; whether an independent actuarial valuation of the various funds administered by the Patriotic Commissioners is contemplated in order that the surpluses may be made available for the necessities of the present war; whether the minutes of evidence taken before the Committee will be presented to this House; and whether the Government will afford an opportunity for the discussion of the Report before the close of the session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe that the main recommendation of the War Funds Committee, to which all the others are subsidiary, is the constitution of a central council, consisting of the representatives of the central and local relief committees, who should organise a uniform system of administration to be carried out by local committees. The War Funds Committee consider that such a council would be best organised with the advice and assistance of the local committees, and the subject is now engaging attention. The Government will await the proposals which may be submitted before deciding on the course which they will take. I am not aware of any ground for questioning the accuracy of the periodical valuations of the funds administered by the Patriotic Commissioners. The minutes of evidence and the appendices to the Report of the Committee will be presented to the House. The last question of the hon. Member I have already answered.

NUMBER OF ARMED FORCES IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what has been the total addition by the taking over of colonial Volunteers, enlistment in the country or in any other manner, to the armed forces landed in South Africa between 1st August, 1899, and 31st May, 1900; what number have been landed since 31st May; and what is the number on the sea but not yet landed.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I am afraid that I do not understand the hon. Member's question. The armed forces landed include, of course, colonial contingents. If he wishes to have the number of colonial as distinguished from British forces, I can only refer him to my statement of 12th March, which placed them actually and prospectively at 21,240 South African, and 8,033 from other self-governing colonies, or 29,273 in all.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Is that number in addition to the 204,000?

*MR. WYNDHAM: No, that total included the 8,033 from other self-governing colonies.

RELEASED BRITISH TROOPS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what course it is proposed to take with reference to the 3,500 British soldiers now liberated who have been captured by the Boers, having regard to the provisions in the Queen's Regulations enjoining the holding of a court of inquiry in connection with every case of surrender to discover the circumstances under which the capture was effected.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Lord Roberts has reported that no blame attaches to the officers who have been released, and that they have been reinstated. No official information has reached the War Office in regard to the liberated non-commissioned officers and men.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, merely as a matter of information, has there been no regular inquiry, and have these prisoners been let loose without any investigation?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I have given the hon. Member all the information I have. The Queen's Regulations lay down that there shall be an inquiry, and I have no reason to suppose that they have been infringed.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I will inquire myself.

ROODEVAL ENGAGEMENT, 7TH JUNE.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the attention of the War Office authorities has been directed to the form of the cablegram from the General of Communications, Cape Town, dated 10th June, announcing the capture at Roodeval of the 4th Battalion of the Derbyshire Regiment on June 7th, in which a short list of casualties several days old forms the bulk of the telegram, while the capture by the Boers of a whole battalion is announced at the end of the message, which stated that Stoneham reported many severely wounded, and remaining 4th Derbyshire and details prisoners, except six rank and file in his camp; whether there is any, and, if so, what explanation of the fact that the casualties were made the main feature of the message, and the capture of a whole battalion a minor incident: and whether directions, as in the case of despatches, will be given to make telegraphic communications with reference to the operations of the troops intelligible.

*MR. WYNDHAM: At the time of despatch of the telegram the General Officer commanding the line of communications was not in possession of any details of the disaster beyond the message from Major Stoneham, the medical officer of the captured hospital, which contained merely a list of casualties. The General Officer forwarded the only information then at his disposal.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the hon. Gentleman tell the General Officer in future not to put the cart before the horse?

INOCULATION OF TROOPS AGAINST FEVER.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he can state how many of the troops inoculated with so-called anti-typhoid serum have had enteric fever in South Africa, how many of those inoculated have since died of enteric fever, and whether any of those inoculated have been invalided home as a direct result of such inoculation; and whether he will state on whose scientific recommendation the Government have been induced to make this experiment on troops sent out to serve in South Africa.

*MR. WYNDHAM: In reply to the first paragraph of the question I must refer the hon. Member to the answer on this subject which I gave on Tuesday. The inoculation was entirely voluntary—there was no idea of making experiments on the troops going out to South Africa. The credit of suggesting the inoculation belongs to the Professor of Pathology at Netley Hospital.

BOER WAR OF 1881—MEDALS.

GENERAL RUSSELL (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that medals have recently been issued to the survivors of those who took part in the Red River and other expeditions now of by no means recent date, the Government will also consider the claim of those who took part in the Boer war of 1881, in connection with which no medal or decoration has as yet been issued, considering the arduous nature of some of the operations, especially the defence of the garrisons.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Medals are not granted for campaigns of which the general result was not successful, and the Boer war of 1881 comes in this category.

ORANGE FREE STATE—PROCLAMATION AS TO REBELS.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether a proclamation has been issued in South Africa to the effect that any of the inhabitants of the Orange Free State found in arms after a certain fixed date will be treated as rebels.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Lord Roberts at the end of May consulted Sir A. Milner as to the issue of a proclamation warning the inhabitants that after being made aware of the annexation, they would be liable to be treated as rebels. I have no further information at present. I have telegraphed to inquire what action has been taken.

Mr. DILLON: Can the right hon. Gentleman state whether or not this action of Lord Roberts was taken with the approval of the home Government?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN did not reply immediately.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: Answer, answer!

Mr. DILLON: If the right hon. Gentleman cannot answer the question, I shall put it on the Paper.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member need not be so hasty. I merely desired to understand what the question (which is put without notice) is about. I am not aware that any action has been taken, and under the circumstances I cannot say whether the action has received the approval of the Home Government or not.

RESUMPTION OF INDUSTRIAL OCCUPATIONS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the telegram, dated 7th June, from Sir Alfred Milner, warning miners who had been employed in the Transvaal mines before the outbreak of hostilities, and who had returned to England in consequence of the war, and were then about to start for the Transvaal from Southampton, to postpone their return to South Africa, was published by the authority of Her Majesty's Government; by what authority, whether of the Imperial Government or of the Cape Government, was Sir Alfred Milner empowered to announce that such miners would be delayed at Cape ports, and would not be permitted for a couple of months to return to their work in the Transvaal mines, and by what means is it contemplated to enforce the prohibition of English miners returning to their work in the Transvaal; and, will the Government take any, and, if so, what steps to remove the impediments to the return of the Uitlanders who were before the war working operatives in mines to the Transvaal.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The reply to the first question is Yes. As to the second and third questions, hostilities are still proceeding in the Transvaal, and whatever measures are necessitated by the military situation will be taken and enforced by the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief in South Africa. The resumption of trade and industry will not be delayed a moment longer than the military exigencies require.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: Am I not correct in saying that the order came from Sir A. Milner and not Lord Roberts? Was it on the authority of the Home Government or the Colonial Government that Sir A. Milner acted?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I answered the first question in the affirmative. It was on the authority of the Home Government.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that during the enforced absence of these English miners their places have been filled up by black labour?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

ALDERSHOT MANŒUVRES—HEAT CASUALTIES.

Colonel DALBIAC (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state at what period of the day the majority of the men fell out during the field day at Aldershot on the 11th instant; and whether, as on former occasions, most of the mischief occurred during the march home along dusty roads in column of route during the hottest part of the day.

*Mr. WYNDHAM: It has been already stated that most of the men fell out on the return march; and the greater part of the march was through country where there are no made roads.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that in August, 1893, in consequence of the sufferings of the troops from the heat of the sun and from thirst and want of food on field days at Aldershot, Sir Evelyn Wood, who was then in command, made a report with strictures on the hardships to which the men had been subjected, and that a divisional order was issued, grounded on that report, which prescribed the giving out of a ration to troops taking part in field days, while commanding officers were made responsible for the examination of men's haversacks and water-bottles to see that the order was made effective; whether he will say if this order was in force at Aldershot on the field day on the 11th instant, and, if not in force, when was it cancelled, and what were the reasons for that course; and, if the order was in force, will he explain why it was not observed on the 11th instant, and state who is responsible for the disregard of its injunctions.

*MR. WYNDHAM: While Sir Evelyn Wood was at Aldershot an extra Government ration was sanctioned for tactical operations at a distance from the camp, while for operations in the vicinity of Aldershot light refreshments were provided from canteen funds. No alteration has been made in this practice. The commanding officers were made responsible that the men's haversacks and water-bottles were examined before the troops marched off parade. The order has never been cancelled, and there is no ground for supposing that it was infringed on the 11th instant.

RESERVE REGIMENT OF LANCERS AT BALLINCOLLIG.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the fact that there are over 400 men in Her Majesty's Reserve Regiment of Lancers at Ballincollig who have no arms, and, though they have 300 horses, have no bridles or saddles; and that there are over 300 recruits in the regiment learning nothing owing to the want of equipment; and, whether, in view of these facts, he will immediately take steps to arm and equip the regiment or disband it.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The regiment is completely equipped with saddles and bridles, and with all arms except lances, which are being supplied as fast as possible.

AIDES-DE-CAMP AND REGIMENTAL DUTY.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that officers of Regular regiments, who are employed as aides-de-camp to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, are not made supernumerary in their regiments by seconding, and that they only do four months duty with their regiments in each year; and whether the experience of the war in South Africa has shown that this limited regimental training is sufficient; and, if not, whether he can see his way to these appointments being limited to officers of the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, whose training would not necessarily be curtailed by being thus employed.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The facts stated in the first paragraph are accurate. There is, however, nothing to show that the officers of the Lord Lieutenant's staff who joined their regiments in South Africa were in any way deficient in regimental training, and it is not thought necessary to make any change in the regulation.

COLONEL WELBY: Are we to understand that four months training in a year is sufficient for an officer?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I would not have my hon. and gallant friend draw any such conclusion from the reply.

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' OUTFIT ALLOWANCES.

COLONEL DALBIAC: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if his attention has been drawn to the fact that those Volunteer officers who have recently been gazetted to commissions in the Army have been called upon to refund the £20 outfit allowance drawn by them upon appointment to Volunteer regiments; and whether, having regard to the circumstances of the case, the repayment of this amount may be remitted, as these officers have now expenses for outfits, especially in the case of those appointed from Rifle regiments to ordinary Line regiments, and *vice versa*.

COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg at the same time to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the regulations have been brought to his notice under which a late officer of the Volunteers, who has received his £10 part uniform allowance, and after passing his school of instruction is entitled to the second instalment of £10, but who, when subsequently appointed to a lieutenancy in the Army, is obliged to refund this grant-in-aid and is not entitled to receive the second instalment; and will he undertake to reconsider cases of this kind with a view of changing the present conditions.

*MR. WYNDHAM: In reply to these questions, the matter is receiving consideration, and it is hoped that a final decision will be arrived at within a few days.

VOLUNTEER CAMPS—MEDICAL OFFICERS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the fact that the medical experience of a surgeon in the Volunteer force cannot be increased by his watching men going through field training for fourteen days, the pay and allowances of one medical officer for the whole period of camp can be sanctioned, and its allotment be left to the commanding officer among such of the surgeons of a regiment whose practice enables them to be present on certain days.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The suggestion will be considered.

VOLUNTEER CAMPS—ALLOWANCES—COMPOSITE REGIMENTS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the operation of the 50 per cent. rule to entitle a Volunteer battalion to pay and allowances for going into camp for fourteen days, and the number of Volunteers who will therefore be deprived of the training the Government now thinks essential, he will allow provisional or composite regiments to be formed on the same lines as in the past.

*MR. WYNDHAM: One of the most important objects of the Volunteer camps is to enable the men belonging to battalions and brigades to train together. The object in view would not be attained by the formation of provisional or composite regiments as suggested. The Secretary of State for War does not therefore consider it expedient to permit the formation of such regiments.

UNDER-AGE RECRUITS—CASE OF PETER WALSH.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that on the 8th instant Peter Walsh, of Donaghmore, county Cork, was enlisted at the Cork barracks upon his own statement that he was over eighteen years of age, and that when Kate Walsh, mother of the lad, applied upon the following day for the discharge of her son, producing at the same time his birth certificate proving that his age was only seventeen, her request was refused, and she was not even permitted access to her son; and whether under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that Peter Walsh was removed to England on the 13th instant, steps will be taken to send him back to his parents.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I explained on Monday, in answer to a similar question, that, under the regulations, if a recruit is over seventeen years of age his retention in the service rests entirely with the General Officer commanding the district, with whose discretion the Secretary of State does not interfere.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Is it intended to retain this boy in the service against the will of his parents?

*MR. WYNDHAM: This question has been asked and answered over and over again. It is a matter of uniform practice, when the recruit has turned seventeen years of age, to retain him in the service until the General Officer commanding decides otherwise.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Why was the mother of the lad refused permission to see him?

[No reply was given.]

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is there no War Office rule by which a recruit is discharged when he is absolutely necessary for the support of his father and mother?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the question.

NAVY—WATER-TUBE BOILERS—H.M.S. "TERRIBLE."

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if H.M.S. "Terrible," fitted with water-tube boilers, sailed from Hong Kong on the 16th inst. upon a service of most grave national emergency in the carrying of troops for the relief of

British citizens in Peking, and arrived at Ta-ku on the 22nd inst., having accomplished the distance of 1,800 miles in five and a half days, or about 13½ miles per hour; whether, seeing that the vessel has formerly attained a trial speed of 22 miles per hour, any explanation of the falling-off in speed can be given; and whether the Admiralty will telegraph to the Admiral in command for an explanation.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (MR. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The hon. Member is wrong in his dates. He states that the "Terrible" arrived on the 22nd. As a matter of fact she landed her troops on the morning of the 21st, so she probably arrived the previous day. We have every reason to believe that the boilers and machinery of the ship are thoroughly efficient. There are no grounds for telegraphing to the Admiral in command on the matter, and I am sure at such a time of strain as this he ought to be troubled with as few demands for explanation as possible.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Will the right hon. Gentleman say what speed, according to his own computation, the vessel did make on this voyage?

MR. GOSCHEN: I am not in a position to make a computation. We do not know whether she accompanied a transport or whether she had to call at any places on the road. I have no doubt she went at the speed she was instructed to travel at.

MR. ALLAN (Gateshead): Can the right hon. Gentleman inform the House why it was that the vessel did not attain her designed speed of twenty-two knots in the case of a grave national emergency?

MR. GOSCHEN: I presume because she had no orders to do it.

BELLEVILLE BOILERS.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the sums of money already spent, and of the still larger sums to be expended in the installation of Belleville boilers in Her Majesty's ships, he will now furnish a full account of the performance of all ships fitted with these boilers.

MR. GOSCHEN: Many statements have been made to Parliament as to the performances of Her Majesty's ships fitted with Belleville boilers, and I desire to keep Parliament fully informed on the subject. Accordingly, I propose, when Vote 8 comes on, to make a very full statement, a course which I hope will be satisfactory to the hon. Gentleman. It is, however, quite impossible to furnish a full account of the performances of all ships fitted with these boilers, as the performance of the boilers only could not be separated in any Return from that of every detail of the machinery, and the preparation of such a Return would entail great labour upon a Department already overwhelmed with work, and also fail to present a true reflection of the situation, as, I presume, is desired by the hon. Gentleman.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will the right hon. Gentleman also on that occasion furnish an account of the vessels fitted with water-tube boilers of types other than the Belleville type?

MR. GOSCHEN: Certainly. I shall deal with the whole question of boilers and machinery.

BREAKDOWN OF H.M.S. "HERMES."

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Admiralty have now received any explanation of the position and extent of the leakage which rendered Her Majesty's ship "Hermes" helpless in mid-ocean; whether this leakage was in the water-tube boilers; and if it is yet known how long the repairs will take.

MR. GOSCHEN: The report of the court of inquiry on the breakdown of the "Hermes" has now been received. The chief cause of the breakdown was the inefficient state of the feed pumps, which had been allowed to become so defective that they were not capable of supplying the necessary feed water to the boilers. The court state there is no reason to suppose that the feed pumps were not efficient when the "Hermes" left England, but that the slight defects which arose in ordinary work were increased by injudicious treatment. The distilling apparatus was also working unsatisfactorily. The leakage appears to have taken place from various steam and drain pipe joints, and in some cases from split boiler tubes, and also water was being pumped into unused boilers and escaping through their safety valves. It would be improper to make any statement at present as to the responsibility for the treatment which the machinery recieved, as the report has not yet been fully considered, and the state of health of the staff engineer in charge did not admit of his exercising the necessary supervision. He has since been invalided. The boilers have been seriously damaged by being worked without sufficient water, and a large number of the tubes will require to be replaced. It is impossible to say at present how long the repairs will take.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Do I correctly understand that the leakage was in the boilers?

MR. GOSCHEN: The hon. Gentleman had better read my answer. I will not venture to go into any further statement of detail.

MR. ALLAN: Has the right hon. Gentleman received any report from the inspector of machinery who was sent out to see the vessel, in which it was stated that——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice must be given of that.

NAVY CHAPLAINS ON THE NORTH AMERICAN AND WEST INDIAN STATIONS.

*MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether on the North America and West Indies station for eleven vessels of the Royal Navy, carrying an aggregate of over 2,600 men and boys, there is but one chaplain; and whether in the Newfoundland fishery squadron, which for nearly half the year forms an independent command, consisting of four sea-going vessels, carrying over 500 men and boys, there is no chaplain; and, if there is a deficiency of chaplains in Her Majesty's Fleet, will the Admiralty endeavour to supply such deficiency by inviting suitable clergymen to serve on Her Majesty's ships for short terms, such as a year, or during the period for which a ship is in commission.

MR. GOSCHEN: There are three chaplains on the North America and West Indies station—namely, one at Bermuda, one at Jamaica, and one in the flagship. There is no chaplain borne in the commodore's ship, but at St. John's, the headquarters of the fishery squadron, there are opportunities of attending divine worship. The majority of the ships on the station have no accommodation for chaplains, but in the case of two of them which have such accommodation a naval instructor has been appointed in lieu of a chaplain and naval instructor (combined), as none of the latter were available. It is hoped that this will be remedied later. There is a deficiency of chaplains capable of acting as instructors, which makes it difficult to supply medium-sized vessels with the number of chaplains desired, but it is not considered to be sufficient to justify the exceptional course suggested in the last part of the hon. Gentleman's question.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): What is the religion of the chaplains in question?

MR. GOSCHEN was understood to reply, "Church of England."

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT OPERATIONS — TIENTSIN AND PEKING.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether there is any news as to events in China.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Yes, Sir, information received to-day leaves no doubt that Admiral Seymour has been extricated, and Tientsin relieved. We have a telegram dated Tientsin, 24th June, as follows:—

> "News of Commander-in-Chief arrived yesterday, and party leaves to-night to succour him. He had seized a small arsenal north of Tientsin called Wu-ku, and was being bombarded by large number of guns. He was in urgent need of relief, having had about forty killed and seventy wounded. This news was brought by a servant of one of the members of the Legation who is fully trustworthy. Foreign settlements were shelled from 18th June to 23rd June. Damage done comparatively slight except in French concession, which has suffered greatly. British Consulate a good deal knocked about. British casualties at Tientsin up to date of relief, four killed and fifty wounded, including in latter six officers."

Sir Charles Scott telegraphed from St. Petersburg at noon to-day—

> "Further official telegram from Admiral Alexieff, Port Arthur, June 27th. During

night of 26th, column from Tientsin, commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel Shirinsky, and consisting of four Russian companies and similar number of foreigners, liberated Admiral Seymour's column, escorting it to Tientsin. 200 of Seymour's column wounded."

I notice in private telegrams, which give the casualties in greater detail, that the number of wounded is placed much higher. We have no news of the Legations beyond that communicated to the press last night, namely, that Sir R. Hart stated they had orders to leave Peking on 20th June. The allied forces at Ta-ku and Tientsin have now been considerably augmented, but we are not aware what action the commanders propose to take.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR CHINA SERVICE.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the cost of sending additional troops from India to China is to be borne by the Indian or the Imperial Exchequer.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will fall on the Imperial Exchequer.

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION—SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether a memorial in favour of separating judicial from executive functions was forwarded to the Government of India in July, 1899, for consideration and report; and whether any, and, if so, what report on the subject has been received from the Government of India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The memorial to which the hon. Member's question refers was forwarded to the Government of India in August, 1899. I have not yet received the Government of India's report upon it.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: When does the noble Lord expect to receive it?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I cannot say. It is a very large question.

JAMAICA FRUIT AND MAIL STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether an estimate for the fruit and mail direct steamship service to and from Jamaica, contracted for by the Crown Agents, will be presented while the contract is lying upon the Table.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The grants in aid for steamer subsidies in the West Indies, viz.: of £5,000 taken on a Supplementary Estimate in July 1898, and of £35,000 included in the original Estimates for 1899–1900, are available to meet, and will more than cover, all payments due in respect to this service.

ASHANTI—INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Is there any news from Coomassie?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: None beyond what has been already published.

THE WAIMA INCIDENT.

MR. BILL (Staffordshire, Leek): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will, before the debate on the Foreign Office Vote is concluded, lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the despatch of the 29th March last, addressed to the French Government with reference to the Waima case; and whether he can now give the House any further information respecting the progress of the negotiations with France on this subject.

MR. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I also wish to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state what stage has been reached in the negotiations with France for compensation to the surviving relatives of the British officers and men killed by French troops at Waima in 1893.

*MR. BRODRICK: The Note to the French Ambassador respecting the Waima incident cannot be laid at present, as negotiations on the case are now proceeding. It is not possible to make a statement at this moment.

NORTHERN MACEDONIA — BRITISH CONSULAR STAFF.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the disturbed condition of affairs in

Northern Macedonia, steps have been taken or will be taken to strengthen the British Consular staff in that part of the Balkan peninsula.

*MR. BRODRICK : Two years ago the British Vice-Consulate, which had hitherto been established at Monastir, was transferred to Uscub because it was considered that the latter place was better situated for the purpose of obtaining trustworthy reports on events in Northern Macedonia. Frequent reports are received from Her Majesty's Vice-Consul there, and Her Majesty's Government do not consider that any grounds exist for creating new consular posts in that part of the country.

REMOVAL OF GRAVEL FROM GREYSTONES.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that gravel is being taken from the foreshore, below high-water mark, at Greystones, county Wicklow, and sold in Liverpool and elsewhere, and that the occupiers of houses situated near the foreshore have protested against the removal of the gravel; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I have received a complaint as to gravel having been taken from the shore at Greystones. I am informed, however, that the greater portion of the gravel so taken has been removed from the beach above high-water mark of ordinary tides, and not from the foreshore. At present I have not sufficient evidence of injury to the coast to justify the issue of a prohibitory Order.

MR. FLAVIN: Has any member of the public a right to take gravel from above high-water mark, or is it the private property of the owner of the land ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS REGULATIONS.

*MR. WARR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether arrangements could be made whereby the Statutory Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks should have an opportunity of considering regulations proposed with regard to Trustee Savings Banks before such regulations are laid before Parliament.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): If the hon. Member is referring to the Trustee Savings Banks Regulations laid on the Table of the House on the 28th May last, I may explain that they were made by the Treasury under Section 2 of the Savings Bank Acts of 1887 (50 and 51 Vict., c. 40), which requires certain regulations for the Post Office Savings Banks to be extended to Trustee Savings Banks. No functions or duties of the Inspection Committee are affected by those alterations, and it did not appear necessary to consult that body formally in the matter.

CROWN QUIT RENTS IN IRELAND.

MR. O'KEEFFE (Limerick): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, seeing that the sum of £37,000 is annually received by the Crown out of the corporate towns in Ireland as quit rents, as is shown by the Returns lately laid upon the Table of the House, whether he can state if any of this impost is or could be applied in use of local taxation.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The annual sum referred to in the question represents quit, etc., rents for lands in all parts of Ireland, and is not received out of corporate towns except to a very small extent. It forms part of the land revenues of the Crown in Ireland, which revenue is by law payable into the Exchequer, and is carried to the Consolidated Fund, and could not be applied as the hon. Member suggests.

PENNY-IN-THE-SLOT MACHINES.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that complaints have been made by the public owing to the way they are being defrauded out of their money by penny-in-the-slot machines, and that two such machines, numbered respectively 17 and 84, are at present placed within the Victoria Station on the South Eastern and Chatham Railway; and whether, owing to the fact that those two machines are receiving money and at the same time giving nothing in return to the people who contribute their pennies, some steps will be taken to prevent any further defrauding of the general public.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): I am not aware of any complaints, and I can only suggest that the hon. Member, or anyone else who has been defrauded in the way suggested should bring an action in the County Court to recover the pennies. I am not aware that there is any evidence of a criminal offence, or that any steps could be taken by the police.

MR. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether inquiry was made into the facts stated in the question, as to the public being actually defrauded?

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I made some inquiries, and elicited from the policeman who went to look at the machines that one was so much out of order that it returned his height at 5ft. 1in. instead of 5ft. 10in.

SMALL TENEMENTS — SUMMARY POWERS OF EVICTION—COMMUNICATION TO LONDON MAGISTRATES.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has recently sent a communication to the London magistrates respecting the summary powers of landlords to evict their tenants, and upon the construction of the Small Tenements Recovery Act, 1838; and, if so, will he state why this communication was sent, and will he lay a copy of the circular upon the Table of the House.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: The question presumably refers to a letter which was written to the late Sir John Bridge on the 25th of January, 1899, with regard to the construction of the first section of the Act. Different views are taken on the question whether the warrant referred to in the concluding words of the section is valid for execution forthwith or not till twenty-one days after its issue. It appeared that at some of the metropolitan police courts the former view was taken, and at others the latter. Sir John Bridge took the view that the warrant is valid forthwith, though the court may allow its operation to be suspended. This interpretation is supported by the opinion of Sir John Jervis and Sir John Romilly when Law Officers of the Crown, and the Lord Chancellor agrees with it. The letter I have mentioned requested Sir John Bridge to bring the Lord Chancellor's opinion to the notice of his colleagues, in order, if possible, to obtain their concurrence in the adoption of a uniform principle in the administration of the Act at all the police courts.

STANDARDS FOR MILK, CREAM, BUTTER, AND CHEESE.

MR. HEDDERWICK: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Departmental Committee, presided over by Lord Wenlock, and appointed to consider whether any regulations as to presumptive standards of quality under Section 4 of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1899, can be made with advantage in respect of milk and cream, have held any meetings and have arrived at any conclusions; and whether any steps have been taken by the Agricultural Board, in exercise of the powers conferred by the Act, to arrive at presumptive standards of quality in respect of butter and cheese.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. LONG, Liverpool, West Derby): The Committee to which the hon. Member refers have held several meetings, but they have not as yet presented their Report. I have not taken any steps with respect to the setting up of presumptive standards for butter and cheese, because I think it best to wait and see if any action can, in the first place, be taken in the case of milk and cream.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS — EXAMINATIONS IN SHORTHAND.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, if it is the intention of the Board to restore in the requirements in shorthand the former rate of forty words per minute.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I am not aware that the requirement of the Education Department in shorthand has ever been changed.

EXPENDITURE ON THE SOUTHALL SCHOOLS.

MR. SPICER (Monmouth Boroughs): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can say whether the expenditure of £12,000 by the Marylebone Guardians on the Southall Schools has provided for an increased number of children, and to what extent this expenditure will increase the cost per head per child.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Of the £12,000, £3,650 is for the provision of receiving homes, which do not form part of the school at all, although they are built on a site adjoining that of the school. These homes will provide accommodation for thirty-six boys and girls, with overflow dormitories for infants. The remaining expenditure (namely, £8,350) is for the erection of a new infirmary at the school, and the conversion of the old infirmary into class-rooms. This will not provide for an increased number of children. I am not able to give a precise answer to the last part of the question of the hon. Member. But the charge for interest and repayment of principal on a loan of £8,350 is about £438 per annum, and as the number of children in the school is 390 this amount is equal to a little over 5d. per head per week.

ST. PANCRAS PAUPER LUNATICS—IRREGULARITIES OF RELIEVING OFFICERS.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he has considered the advisability of holding a Local Government Board inquiry into the irregularities committed by the relieving officers of St. Pancras in the matter of the transfer and custody of pauper lunatics from that union.

MR. CHAPLIN: I am much obliged to my hon. friend for the opportunity of stating what action the Local Government Board have taken and are taking in this matter. There can be no doubt that the irregularities referred to, unless they are promptly and effectually stopped, would inevitably lead to scandals of the gravest kind, and I have directed an immediate investigation by the Local Government Board into this matter. Apart from the cases referred to there is reason to believe that the system is more or less widely practised elsewhere in the Metropolis. Pending the inquiry therefore, I have directed a communication to be made to the Metropolitan Boards of Guardians to the effect that in the opinion of the Board the practice is altogether indefensible, and that any officer offending in this respect in the future should be dismissed. As to the past, when I have the results of the inquiry before me I shall be better able to judge if any further action on the part of the Board is required.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD—ASSISTANT LABORATORY CLERK.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a clerical assistant with about two years service has been appointed, without examination, assistant laboratory clerk at the Local Government Board at a salary of £120 per annum, rising by annual increments of £5 to £200 per annum; and whether, seeing that there are serving in the Local Government Board twenty-one senior assistant clerks with a service of from fifteen to twenty-seven years, who are only receiving an increment of £2 10s., rising only to a maximum of £150 per annum, and that the appointment referred to does not entail the possession of special technical qualifications, it could have been offered, as some encouragement, to one of the deserving senior assistant clerks in that Department.

MR. CHAPLIN: As regards the first paragraph the answer is in the negative. In reply to the second paragraph—the appointment, no doubt, could have been offered to any one I selected, but the clerk in question was chosen because he had been employed in the laboratory for some time past, and strong representations were made as to his special fitness for the post by those who were best acquainted with his work and capabilities.

LIVERPOOL P.O.—TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT STAFF.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the number of the temporary staff employed at the Liverpool Post Office in the sorting and telegraph branches can be stated; whether the learners are regarded as temporary clerks; and, if so, whether their service is to count for pension purposes; and whether, in view of the increase of work, the Postmaster General will consider the advisability of increasing the permanent staff.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The temporary staff of these branches at Liverpool comprises thirty-one males and three females. Learners are not regarded as temporary clerks. Their service, being part time only, does not count for pension. A revision of the Liverpool staff is under consideration in connection with the removal to the new post office, and an increase in number will be provided for.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I have been unable to hear a word of the right hon. Gentleman's reply. Will be supply me with a copy of the answer?

MR. HANBURY: Certainly.

LIVERPOOL P.O.—APPOINTMENTS TO INSPECTORSHIPS OF MESSENGERS.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether in the Liverpool office inspectors of messengers have been appointed to perform work previously allotted to telegraphists; whether such duties involve a monetary responsibility; and whether, in view of the decision of the Postmaster General upon this subject in 1896, instructions will be given that telegraphists are to perform these duties as heretofore.

MR. HANBURY: It is in contemplation to create six appointments to the class of inspector of telegraph messengers at Liverpool. The duties attaching to these places have hitherto been performed by sorting clerks and telegraphists, but they more properly belong to the class of inspectors. Beyond the payment of the weekly wages of messengers, the only monetary responsibility involved is the custody of a small sum used for paying out locomotion charges on the delivery of telegrams, etc. The hon. Member's reference to a decision of the Postmaster General in 1896 is not understood.

BRIGHTON P.O.--EFFICIENCY BARRIER —CASE OF SIMMONS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the case of a telegraphist named Simmons, of the Brighton office, who has been stopped at the efficiency barrier for incompetence; whether, since the notification Simmons has been at times in charge of the instrument gallery, relieving an assistant superintendent; and whether, in view of the fact that Simmons has been denied access to a class of operators on the ground of alleged inefficiency, the Postmaster General will re-consider his decision in view of the fact that Simmons' superiors consider him able to supervise the work of other telegraphists.

MR. HANBURY: I replied to the questions on this case put by the hon. Member on the 17th and 24th of last month.* The duties on which Mr. Simmons has been employed since that date are those of the rank and file, except that on Saturday the 16th instant he was, as the senior sorting clerk and telegraphist present, in charge of the instrument room during the absence of the assistant superintendent from 10.10 p.m. to midnight, a time when the work is very small. Mr. Simmons is afforded every facility for improving himself in the knowledge of those duties in which he is deficient, and it was owing to this arrangement that he was the senior sorting clerk and telegraphist on duty on the night of the 16th inst. The Postmaster General regrets that the circumstances are not such as to justify an alteration of the decision already given.

PROMOTED ABSTRACTORS—RETENTION OF ALLOWANCES.

MR. STEADMAN (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the fact that the Treasury, has agreed that in the Customs an abstractor holding a personal allowance of £30 shall be permitted to count it as salary upon promotion to the second division, there is any reason why an abstractor holding a personal allowance in the Board of Trade is not permitted to count his allowance as salary upon promotion to the second division.

MR. HANBURY: If the hon. Member will kindly furnish me with the particulars of the cases to which he refers, I will cause inquiry to be made.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiii., pages 416 and 1113.

GREENOCK SCHOOL BOARD—CHILDREN'S PRIZES.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that it is customary for the School Board of Greenock to provide children's prizes from the public rate; and whether such a practice is in conformity with the Education Act, which provides that such rate is only to be used for purely educational purposes.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am aware that the School Board of Greenock, like many school boards in Scotland, provide prizes out of the school fund. The Department is advised that the Education Acts do not make it illegal to provide book or other similar prizes at the cost of the school fund, if the school board is satisfied that the efficiency of the school is thereby promoted.

IRELAND—TENANT PURCHASER, D. ALLEN.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a caution against the registration of a deed to John Woods, of the farm of David Allen, Cabragh, Irvinestown, sold in March for non-payment of one half-year's annuity (afterwards paid to the Land Commission and receipted for by receivable order), was, without evidence, ruled out by the registering authority simply on a letter from the Land Commission; is he aware that in ordinary cases the registering authority is particularly strict as regards evidence; can he state why there was an exception in Allen's case; and if he can hold forth a hope that the case of this man will be reconsidered.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The holding referred to was sold by the Land Commission under their statutory powers, and the registering authority was so informed. The purchaser has been put into possession, and the sale to him is now complete.

ULSTER RATE COLLECTIONS.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that in several towns in Ulster the collectors of the county council refuse to receive from ratepayers the sum separately mentioned in the poor rate receipts as due in respect of union charges without payment at the same time of the sums due on foot of county at large charges; and whether the action of the collector in this respect is in accordance with the regulations of the Irish Local Government Board.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The action of a poor rate collector in refusing to accept a part payment of the poor rate is correct. The rate due is one entire sum, although made up of various items of expense, and the collector can only issue one legal receipt for the full amount. He is expressly forbidden by Article 13, Subsection 3 of the County (Poor Rate Collectors) Order, 1899, to give any other receipt whatever.

LICENCE TRANSFERS AT ROCKCORRY PETTY SESSIONS.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the agent for Lord Dartrey's estate, county Monaghan, applied for and was granted a transfer of a spirit licence at the Rockcorry Petty Sessions on Thursday last, although the agent is a magistrate for the district in which he obtained the transfer in his own name; and can he state what are the circumstances which led to this application for the licence, and who were the magistrates who granted the licence, and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Mr. Leslie, a justice of the peace for the district of Rockcorry and agent of Lord Dartrey, obtained the transfer, until the next quarter sessions, of licensed premises which he had purchased from the executors of a deceased publican, a tenant on the estate mentioned. The justices who granted the transfer were Messrs. Henry and McCabe, and there seems to be nothing in the matter calling for any intervention on the part of the Government.

MR. MACALEESE: Was Mr. Leslie an acting justice of the peace at the time he held the licence?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I must ask for notice.

R.I.C. JUBILEE FUND.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the Jubilee Fund of the Royal Irish Constabulary, whether inquiry will be made with a view to ascertain how far the force, who own the fund, have any voice in its management; and whether steps will be taken to have it placed entirely under the control of the subscribers.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: As I have already stated this fund is not one over which the Government exercise any control, and any suggestions as to changes in its management should be made to the Committee of Management or to the Inspector General.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Will steps be taken to ascertain the views of the subscribers?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I have nothing whatever to do with the matter.

LORD LANSDOWNE AND HIS TENANTS.

MR. T. J. FARRELL (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of ejectment decrees granted at the last Cahirciveen Quarter Sesssions at the suit of Lord Lansdowne against his tenants.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The number of such decrees granted was four.

MR. FLAVIN: How many people has the noble Lord turned off his estate?

[No answer was given.]

IRISH RATE BOOKS.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that it is now impossible, owing to the form of the new rate books, for clerks of unions to supply the Income Tax Commissioners with copies of the rate books showing particularly the names of the immediate landlords of every holding, and for the poor rate collectors who are requested, when furnishing their lists of tenements requiring revision, to insert the names of the immediate lessors; and, whether, seeing that the omission will lead to complications where the same tenant holds from two different landlords on the same townland, and that the form now issued is a departure from the form prescribed in the order of the Local Government Board, dated 19th April, 1899, he will advise the Local Government Board to order the names of immediate lessors to be inserted in the rate books.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The County Councils Order of the 18th April, 1899, prescribes a form of rate book which contains a column for names of immediate lessors liable to be rated. The Local Government Board have never prescribed any other form, but, to meet as far as possible the wishes of certain county councils to have the number of columns in the rate book reduced, the Board prepared an alternative form of rate book, in which a column is given for "the name of person rated" only. The notes on the form show that where the immediate lessor is rated the name should be underlined. In this way the immediate lessors can be at once identified. I am not aware what particulars are required by the Income Tax Commissioners, but the form of collectors' book prescribed by the County (Poor Rate Collectors) Order of 17th April, 1899 (which has not been altered), contains a column in which the collector is to insert all information which may be necessary for the purposes of the Valuation, Registration, and Jurors Acts.

TARBERT AND KILRUSH STEAMERS.

MR. O'KEEFFE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, as President of the Board of Works in Ireland, if he will direct that the steamer at present running under Government subsidy from Tarbert to Kilrush should commence plying in future from Foynes, midway on the River Shannon, and thereby give additional facilities for tourists to visit Kilkee and the coasts of county Clare.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in describing the Chief Secretary as President of the Board of Works in Ireland. I have no power to give the direction suggested in the question, but the Board of Works are in hopes of carrying out such an extension of the existing service between Tarbert and Kilrush as will enable the steamer to call at Foynes.

ARREARS OF TITHE RENT—PROCEEDINGS FOR RECOVERY.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland in how many cases during the last two years have proceedings been taken on the equity side of the county courts for recovery of arrears of tithe rent.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): During the period mentioned in the question, proceedings of the nature referred to were taken in three cases.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether the Land Commission can state approximately what amount of costs of proceedings, receiver's fees, receiver's solicitors' fees, passing accounts and discharging receivers have been paid by the owners of tithe rent during the last two years for which accounts are complete.

Mr. ATKINSON: It is presumed that the hon. Member refers to tithe rent-charge payers, not "owners." The Land Commission have no information on that part of the question which relates to receiver's fees, or receiver's solicitors' costs, either for passing accounts or for discharging receivers. The approximate amount paid to the Land Commission for costs incurred by them in appointment of receivers during the two years ending 30th June, 1900, is £240.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether complaints have reached him that receivers are appointed for the recovery of arrears of tithe rent-charge in many cases in which the costs of proceedings, receiver's fees, receiver's solicitors' fees, passing accounts and costs of discharging receivers far exceed the amounts originally due; and whether he can say in how many cases during the last three years receivers have been appointed in respect of sums (*a*) under £10, (*b*) under £20, and (*c*) under £50.

Mr. ATKINSON: The first part of this question does not appear to refer exclusively to the Land Commission, as lay impropriators have similar powers of procedure, but in most of the cases in which the Land Commission receive tithe rent-charge from receivers appointed by the Court of Chancery the receivers have been appointed at the suit of parties other than the Land Commission. During the period mentioned in the second paragraph, receivers were appointed in two cases in respect of sums under £10; in four cases under £20; and in six cases under £50. In four of these twelve cases the costs of the Land Commission exceeded the actual debt due to the Commission, but no other proceedings would have enabled the Commission to realise their debt.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if he will state who appoints the receivers in cases for recovery of arrears of tithe-rent; how and on what principle they are selected; and why the solicitor to the Land Commission does not act as receiver.

Mr. ATKINSON: The receivers in such cases are invariably appointed by the Land Judge, who usually appoints the district receiver nearest to the lands as the person who can most conveniently and advantageously collect the rents. It is not the practice to appoint the solicitor for parties to proceedings as receiver under the Court.

CELTIC GOLD ORNAMENTS AND THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if a coroner's inquisition, as recommended by the Irish Crown Solicitor, was held upon the gold ornaments found at Limavady, which were recently placed in the British Museum, and are alleged to be treasure trove, and if any evidence on oath has been taken in relation to the discovery of these objects; whether it has been proved that no express grant of the franchise of treasure trove has been established in the district in question; whether the Irish Crown Solicitor stated that the information upon which he held the ornaments to be treasure trove was obviously unsatisfactory; and whether he can state the decisions given in cases where articles of silver and gold have been discovered in the earth without there being any presumptive evidence of their having been of ancient time hidden.

MR. ATKINSON: My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this question. The reply to each of the three questions contained in the first and second paragraphs is in the negative. The Irish Crown Solicitor made the statement mentioned in a certain communication made by him to the Treasury, but a reference to the context will show that by the word "unsatisfactory" he intended to convey that the evidence then forthcoming was not as full and detailed as was desirable. I cannot possibly answer the last question in the form in which it is put, but I will be happy to furnish my noble friend with the authorised reports of two of the most recent cases on treasure trove, where he will find the principle of law applicable to the subject discussed and determined.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the opinions of the Law Officers referred to be communicated to the House?

MR. ATKINSON: That has already been done.

REDEMPTION OF TITHE RENT-CHARGE.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if he will state what is the procedure usually taken by the Land Commission, and what are the costs and expenses usually and necessarily incurred before redemption of tithe rent, and whether any effort is made to settle or compromise with the owners.

MR. ATKINSON: No charge of any kind is made by the Land Commission either by way of costs or expenses, in connection with the redemption of tithe rent-charges. As the redemption price in cases of voluntary redemption is fixed by Statute (35 and 36 Vict. c. 90, s. 7), no question as to compromise can arise. In cases under the Purchase Acts the redemptions come under Section 37 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896, and the Land Commission are empowered to order the redemption at a price of not less than twenty times the net amount of the charge after allowing for poor rates.

WEST COAST OF IRELAND FISHERIES.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland whether he is aware that loss and injury has from time to time been inflicted on the owners and fishermen engaged in mackerel fishing off the west coast of Kerry, especially in the Cahirciveen and the Shannon mouth districts, by the illegal interference of trawlers; and whether there is any bye-law in existence in those districts for the better protection of the fishing boats engaged in the fishing industry; and, if not, will instructions be given to the Fishery Board to hold such inquiry as may be deemed advisable, with the object of making such necessary bye-laws.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKETT, Dublin Co., S.): There is no bye-law in force prohibiting trawling in the mouth of the Shannon, and no application for a bye-law has ever been received. If, however, an application be made to the Department by persons interested and who are in a position to give evidence on the subject, an inquiry will be held as soon as practicable. With regard to trawling in the other waters referred to in the question, namely, between Dunmore Head and Scariff Island, I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member's previous question of Monday last on the same subject.

MR. FLAVIN: Is it not the fact that complaints were made to the captain of the gunboat "Argus," and that he was asked to prevent this illegal trawling, but he found he could not interfere because there was no bye-law in existence? Were not the inspectors then set on to make inquiry?

MR. PLUNKETT: I believe the Fishery Inspectors are making further inquiry.

IRISH SCIENCE TEACHERS' FEES.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture and Industries of Ireland whether the science teachers in England are admitted free to the summer course and their fares paid from distant parts and an allowance given for their sustenance while in London, while the Irish teachers have to pay a fee of £2 and have no allowance whatever for expenses of railway fare or sustenance; whether he is aware that about eighty Irish teachers attended the summer course last year under these circumstances, and that 158 attended in London with much greater advantages; and whether steps will be taken immediately to equalise the financial terms of Irish and English teachers attending the summer science classes.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Summer courses for teachers in Ireland at the Royal College of Science, Dublin, were sanctioned experimentally in 1899. The courses were intended for the intermediate school teachers for whom there were previously no such facilities. The charge of £2 is made only to teachers belonging to institutions not connected with the Science and Art Department or the National Board of Education, but of the eighty-one teachers who availed themselves of the courses in 1899, only three paid this fee. Exactly the same facilities are offered to all trained teachers, qualified under the rules of the Board of Education, South Kensington, to teach science classes, in Ireland as in England. They receive railway fare, and, when coming from Ireland, first-class steamboat fare, and an allowance not exceeding £3 towards their expenses. Out of 185 teachers who attended at South Kensington last year, fourteen came from Ireland. The science teachers of England and Ireland referred to in the question are in fact on a different status. Those who come to London are trained and recognised teachers, whether English or Irish. The Irish course is, however, intended to train hitherto untrained teachers.

BRITISH MUSEUM BILL.

Mr. BIRRELL (Fifeshire, W.): I beg to ask the right hon. Member for the Montrose Burghs what course he proposes to take with respect to the British Museum Bill standing on the Orders for Second Reading this day.

Mr. J. MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I need not recall to the House the fact that was stated the other day from the Government bench—that this Bill was framed and introduced at the request of the Treasury, and that its introduction was made a condition precedent to their taking into consideration certain proposals made by the trustees for the extension of their buildings. The First Lord of the Treasury told the House—and he has since communicated the view to the Trustees—that this Bill is a Government measure, and that the Government are responsible for it. At the same time he says very fairly that he is unable to take any steps for pressing the Bill forward, or for helping me to do so, unless it be clear that the Bill is unopposed or non-contentious. I am afraid, from all the signs that one may read in the Parliamentary sky that it is by no means likely to be an unopposed measure, but that, on the contrary, it will give rise to a great deal of contention.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. MORLEY: My right hon. friend cheers that prophecy. I can only say that the evil to be remedied by this Bill is a very real one. We have found that the museum is obliged by law to receive, lodge, sort, and catalogue great quantities of printed matter which, in my opinion, no rational man would desire to preserve; and whatever course be taken by the Government in respect of this Bill the evil will one day or another have to be remedied, as the newspapers are increasing at a most formidable rate. But, seeing that the undertaking of the right hon. Gentleman is so qualified, I think I shall best do what I desire to do—that is, consult the convenience of the House—by not asking him to take up the time of the House in reading a second time a Bill with which there is practically no intention of proceeding. Therefore, I would propose to withdraw the Bill, in the expectation that Her Majesty's Government will, during the recess, consider the expediency of asking the House for a vote of £100,000, which, in addition to the £50,000 of bequest now in our hands, will enable us to provide storage for the newspapers and other matter for a period of thirty years. I repeat that the evil remains to be dealt with, and if any Member of the House is able to propose a method of dealing with the problem in a manner more satisfactory than that of the present Bill, the trustees, at all events, will offer no opposition.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Could not the trustees find a little more storage room by giving us back our gold ornaments?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CHANNING: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state when it is proposed to take the Local Government Board Vote.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I can give no information at the present moment.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Having regard to the important announcement made by the First Lord of the Admiralty, can the Leader of the House say when the Shipbuilding Vote will be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it is convenient to arrange for taking Votes a long while beforehand. If my hon. friend will put a question on Monday I will then say if we can take the Vote next Friday.

SIR CHARLES CAMERON (Glasgow, Bridgeton): In what order will the Scotch Estimates be taken to-morrow?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I imagine in the order they appear on the Paper.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR reported from the Chairmen's Panel, That they had appointed Mr. Arthur O'Connor to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Companies Bill; and Mr. Laurence Hardy to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Money-lending Bill [Lords].

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to the County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill and the Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Reserve Forces Act, 1882." Reserve Forces Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Military Manœuvres Act, 1879, and to give further facilities for Rifle and Artillery Practice." Military Manœuvres Bill [Lords].

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES).

That they give leave to the Marquess of Bristol to attend in order to his being examined as a Witness before the Select Committee appointed by this House on Hospitals (Exemption from Rates), his Lordship, in his place, consenting.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): This subject has already been brought before the House twice—once last year by myself upon the introduction of a substantially identical measure, and again in the early part of this session by my right hon. friend the Attorney General for Ireland. The changes which this Bill, if placed upon the statute-book, will make in the existing law fall into two classes—first, changes relating to the machinery for varying tithe rent-charge in Ireland; and, secondly, provisions which are designed to relieve the payers of ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge from certain grievances under which they suffer arising out of the Church Acts of 1869 and 1872. In dealing with the provisions relating to machinery for varying the tithes, we propose to alter both the standard of variation and also the procedure by which that variation is carried out. In order to make known to the House our reason for making these changes it will be necessary for me to very briefly describe the system hitherto existing in Ireland. Prior to the Act of 1823 all Irish tithes were paid in kind by the occupier. After 1823 money compositions were substituted for payment in kind; and the amount of such compositions was arrived at by agreement between tithe-owner and tithe-payer, or was assessed by special Commissioners. Of course while tithes were in kind, the value of the tithe varied with the value and amount of the product. This character of variability was retained in the money compositions, the standard of variation being the septennial average prices of wheat or oats as the case might be, and the average prices were to be taken from the *Dublin*

Gazette. Whether wheat or oats was used as the measure depended upon the particular corn mentioned in the certificate of composition for each parish. The Act of 1838 converted tithe into tithe rent-charge, and transferred the liability for its payment from the occupier to the landlord. It became, in fact, what its name implies—a charge upon rent; but this charge was fixed at 25 per cent. less than the previous money composition. The new tithe rent-charges, however, remained variable with the price of either wheat or oats, as ascertained from the *Dublin Gazette*, just as the old compositions had been variable, and the procedure by which the variation was to be carried out deserves special attention in connection with the proposals we make in this Bill. The first point that strikes one is that the Legislature took better care of both tithe-owners and tithe-payers in England than it did in Ireland. In England machinery was provided by means of which the rent-charge was varied automatically every year, according to the septennial average prices of wheat, barley, and oats for the preceding seven years. This is carried out without expense or trouble to either tithe-owner or tithe-payer. In Ireland no such machinery was provided. It was left to the tithe-owner, or to at least three tithe-payers (each liable to pay £3 yearly for tithe rent-charge) to move in the matter at his or their expense. Assuming that three rent-charge payers could be found in a parish willing to move in the matter, they were restricted in taking action to a particular year, once in every seven years, and to a particular time in that year—namely, between 1st May and 1st October. The particular year in which action could be taken depended upon the date of the certificate of composition, and this was an uncertain date, varying in every parish, as the compositions were established at dates ranging over the years 1823 to 1838. But assuming that these facts were not lost sight of by the rent-charge payers or the tithe-owner, no variation could be made unless the particular kind of corn to be followed as the standard of variation was greater or less by one-tenth than the price mentioned in the certificate of composition of that kind of corn. Assuming, further, that the parties moving in the matter were satisfied that they had a good *primâ facie* case, they still had before them the technical procedure of notices to be served and proofs to be given, and if in these their case broke down they had to wait another seven years. It cannot, therefore, be surprising to find, as the result of such legislation, that out of 2,450 parishes it appears, after careful inquiry, that only sixty passed through the formidable ordeal of variation between 1838 and 1872. There may be a few more than this number, but something very trifling. There are entire counties, and nearly entire provinces, in which the rent-charge remains to this day the same in amount as when it was established. Subsequent to 1872 the fall of prices has naturally stimulated payers of tithe rent-charge to make applications for the variation of the charge. But within the last two or three years, over and above the difficulties of procedure which I have described, a further and final obstacle has absolutely barred the way to the success of any such application. This obstacle has arisen out of a decision of the Appeal Court, the effect of which is that owing to irregularities in the publication of corn averages in the *Dublin Gazette* the payer of tithe is practically deprived of his right to have the charge varied, and variations actually carried out in the tithe rent-charge on the basis of those averages have been declared invalid. This is a manifest injustice. Finding ourselves under the absolute necessity of providing a remedy, and being further pledged to redress certain other grievances affecting the payer of ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge, we judged it best to deal with the whole question of tithe rent-charge in a comprehensive spirit, and attempt a general reform of the system, which has always been exceedingly cumbersome, and which, in consequence of the change which has taken place in Irish agricultural prices, is now antiquated as well. The changes we propose are twofold. We propose to make the procedure automatic; and we propose to establish a new standard of variation. With respect to the first of these changes, I hardly anticipate that any serious objection will be offered to the principle. The complicated technicalities and innumerable legal pitfalls which the existing system presents make it really indefensible; and in face of the fact that in England an automatic system is in use, it will hardly be contended that this part of our reform, in principle at least, is not legitimate and desirable. As regards the new basis of variation, there may perhaps be more difference of opinion. It may be asked, "Why not be content to correct and make good the irregularities which have occurred in connection with the publication of corn averages in the *Dublin Gazette*, and go on as before." One answer to this is that if variation is to be made automatic, it is desirable to have some simpler measure of variation than average prices —in some parishes of wheat, in others of oats—as compared with the average prices of these cereals at dates differing with the date of the certificate of composition in each parish. But a still more important consideration is this, that in consequence of the changes which have come over Irish agriculture, and the wide discrepancy in the variations in the price of wheat as compared with that of oats, the old basis of variation of tithe rent-charge has become capricious to the point of absurdity. No sane man would dream of adopting it to-day, if a system of variation had to be established for the first time; and if we are to touch this question at all with a view to greater simplicity of procedure, the problem of reform in the standard of variation is almost forced upon us. It is to be remembered in connection with this matter that the original composition or money payments fixed for tithes in any parish were not fixed or agreed to by reference to the one cereal standard mentioned in the tithe certificate for subsequent variation. The compositions were for the value of all tithes in kind in the parish. The ancient law was "of common right tithes are to be paid of such things only as do yield a yearly increase by the act of God," and not only included cereals but clovers, beans, peas, flax, turnips, potatoes, calves, colts, lambs, wool, etc. The cereal mentioned in the certificate was for variation only. At the time of the Tithes Acts in Ireland (1823 to 1838), before the days of importation, wheat and oats were widely grown and their prices were relative to other agricultural products and to each other. It was a comparatively reasonable standard at that time, but now the absurdity, I may say the irrelevancy, of the old standards of variation at the present day may be judged by the following figures relating to the provinces of Leinster and Munster. In Leinster, wheat is the standard in 60 per cent. of the parishes, oats in the remaining 40 per cent. In Munster, wheat is the standard in 55 per cent., and oats in 45 per cent. But to-day wheat has almost ceased to be grown in either of these provinces. The average annual acreage under wheat fifty years ago was, in Leinster, 195,000, in Munster, 160,000 (in round figures). The average annual acreage in the septennial period from 1892 to 1899 was, in Leinster, 14,748, and in Munster, 17,245—a fall in Leinster from 195,000 to 14,000, in Munster from 160,000 to 17,000! From these figures it appears that though wheat has practically disappeared as a test of agricultural products or their values in Leinster and Munster, nevertheless, if the old system for tithe variation was maintained, in more than half the parishes in those provinces the variation would be calculated on the standard of wheat, the price of which is now, owing to importation, American gambling, and other reasons, 60 per cent. to 50 per cent. lower than it was in 1821 or 1872. Oats, on the other hand, which rather more than held its price per barrel up to 1872, although it has fallen in price since then, has not fallen by much more than 20 per cent. The maintenance of the whole system would, therefore, in adjoining parishes in these provinces produce the most uneven, arbitrary, and capricious differences, which could not be justified by any present difference in agricultural prosperity between them, or in the power to pay the charge as tested by the alteration in rents under the Land Acts. In Ulster and Connaught the general result is the same, though the case is not quite so strong. These arbitrary discrepancies, resting on the mere accident whether wheat or oats was the cereal mentioned in the tithe certificate, might be tolerated under a system in which legal difficulties made the variations few and far between, but I venture to say they would no longer be thought tolerable under an automatic system, in which they would become patent and glaring. In these circumstances some change in the basis of variation appears to me to be imperatively called for. Other standards might possibly be suggested. But, having regard to the nature of tithe rent-charge, which in name and essence is a charge upon rent, I think I am justified in contending that our proposal to vary the charge in proportion to the average variations in judicial rents, is at once the simplest, the most equitable, and the most appropriate. I pass now from the question of procedure to the ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge, as distinguished from the lay tithe rent-charge, and I am quite conscious I am treading on more controversial ground, or at any rate on ground which hon. Gentlemen opposite choose to regard as controversial. I presume it is to this part of the Bill that the hon. Member for East Mayo more especially objects.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Hear, hear!

Mr. G. W. BALFOUR: Our proposals in this direction have been described as proposals for grabbing the Church Fund, and the hon. Member for East Mayo has described them as indecent and outrageous. During five years experience as Chief Secretary for Ireland I have frequently listened to similar descriptions of measures emanating from the Government, but I find some difficulty in taking the hon. Member seriously on this occasion. If, however, I could induce him to be impartial, I should not altogether despair of convincing even him that the provisions of the Acts of 1869 and 1872 imposed grievances on the payers of ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge which claim the consideration of Parliament, and that our proposals are really moderate and reasonable. The proposals in this Bill which will affect the resources of the Church Fund are four in number. First, to reduce the period of currency for the redemption of tithe rent-charge annuities from fifty-two to forty-five years; secondly, in the case of unredeemed ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge, to restore with modifications its original character of variability; thirdly, to withdraw the right of redeeming such tithe rent-charge for the future except in the case of transactions under the Land Purchase Acts; fourthly, to make new provision with respect to the deduction of poor rate from tithe rent-charge. Which of these proposals excites the indignation of the hon. Member for East Mayo? It cannot be the third or fourth, because they will increase and not diminish the resources of the Church Fund; and it can hardly be the first, because every fair-minded man must regard that as unanswerable and irresistible. The annuities run at present for fifty-two years at £4 9s. per cent. on twenty-two and a half years purchase of the net tithe rent-charge purchased. Mr. Gladstone distinctly stated, when introducing the Church Bill in 1869, that the rate of interest to be charged on the instalment was to be 3½ per cent. But, as a matter of fact, a fifty-two years term involves a rate of interest not of £3 10s., but of £3 16s. 4d. per cent.; and conversely, if the interest is taken at £3 10s. per cent., the period for which the annuity is to run should be forty-five, not fifty-two, years. Objection to this provision of the Bill must therefore be made on either of two grounds: First, that a 3½ per cent. rate of interest is too low—which would be a bold assertion in the face of Mr. Gladstone's own statement, and of the fact that the rates of interest formerly paid by tenant purchasers of Church lands have all been reduced from 3½ per cent. to 3⅛ per cent. Or, secondly, that it is just that a terminable annuity for the redemption of a capital sum should continue to be paid for seven years after such capital sum can be shown by the rules of arithmetic to have been repaid. In leaving the hon. Member for East Mayo the choice between these alternatives, I am forced to conclude that it is against the second of these proposals I have enumerated that he means to concentrate attack—namely, the proposal to restore the variability taken away by the Act of 1872.

Mr. DILLON: It must not be understood that I have abandoned my first proposal.

Mr. G. W. BALFOUR: I will deal with it later on.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): How much money is involved in the matter?

Mr. G. W. BALFOUR: I will deal with that point before I sit down. Before the Irish Church Acts, ecclesiastical and lay tithe rent-charge were on the same footing. The Act of 1872, taken together with the Act of 1869, while fixing the amount of the ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge, at the same time gave a right to the tithe-payer to redeem the charge. These two provisions are closely connected together, for it was apparently with a view to redemption, and in the belief that all tithe rent-charge payers would promptly redeem, that the variability of the charge was taken away. But as a matter of fact it has not so turned out, for although many tithe-payers have redeemed either by payment of a sum down or by means of terminable annuities, the Church Fund still derives an annual income from unredeemed tithe rent-charge of over £160,000. Since 1872 the price of wheat has fallen about 50 per cent., and the price of oats more than 20 per cent. Had it not been for the Act of 1872 the payers of unredeemed tithe rent-charge would have been entitled to go into court and get the charge correspondingly reduced. It is safe to say that this heavy fall in prices that occurred after 1872 was not foreseen by anybody in 1872, and that had it been foreseen the Act of 1872 would never have been passed. The arrangement has turned out greatly to the disadvantage of the tithe-payers, and in a way which it is certain neither they nor Mr. Gladstone ever anticipated. And, as if to give point to the hardship, while the charge has been compulsorily fixed, the rent out of which the charge is paid has been in almost every case compulsorily reduced. Is not this a legitimate grievance? Is it not a grievance which Parliament may fairly and properly be asked to redress? Why, if the grievance had been one that affected not landlords but tenants in Ireland, we should have had one hon. Member after another rising from the benches opposite, declaiming, denouncing, and clamouring for a remedy. But because it is the landlord class which suffers, and not the tenant farmers, we are told our proposals are infamous and outrageous. And, after all, what are these proposals? Do we propose to re-open contracts, to lower the rate of interest of annuities now current, or otherwise to facilitate the terms of payment? No; we simply propose to replace the payers of ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge in the position in which they stood before the Church Acts were passed, in the position in which the lay tithe-payer stands to-day. We propose to relieve them of a disability which those Acts imposed upon them, but at the same time to withdraw from them a privilege which those Acts conferred. Consider the case of the Church glebe tenants. By Section 23 (1) of the Purchase of Land Act of 1885 the rates of interest on the mortgages of the tenants who had purchased glebe lands were all reduced from 3½ to 3⅛ per cent. By Sections 25 and 26 of the Land Law Act of 1896, by the application of the decade system, the annuities of the Church glebe tenants were reduced by very nearly one half. No one suggested that the making of these concessions to the Church tenants by reduction of interest or by extending the mortgage terms was "grabbing" the Church surplus or "plundering" the fund. On the contrary, the principle was recognised that the burden of those whose payments constitute the Church Fund should not be unduly heavy, in order to maintain that fund at a higher level than broad considerations of equity would justify. If we had preserved intact the provisions of the Act of 1872, and made the same concessions to tithe-payers as have been made to the glebe tenants, the loss to the Church Fund would have been considerably greater than it is likely to be under this Bill. In this circumstance I am curious to hear by what arguments the opposition to these proposals will be supported. So far I have heard but one argument used against them worthy of the name. It is alleged that the stereotyping of the Church tithe rent-charges was the result of an arrangement with the then Government at the instance of the tithe rent-charge payers, principally Irish landlords, which they considered advantageous to themselves, as they were apprehensive that a variation of the tithe rent-charge on the prices prevailing immediately prior to 1872 would have increased their liability, and further because they expected that prices would continue to rise. The transaction is represented as a kind of bargain freely entered into by the landlords, from the effects of which they ought not to be relieved simply because events have turned out contrary to their expectations. I believe that for this allegation there exists no ground whatever in fact. There is certainly no evidence of it in *Hansard*. The Bill was brought forward in the House of Lords, and passed through both Houses practically without debate or discussion. I have made inquiries of persons who would have been in a position to know if any such bargain or understanding had taken place, and they have no recollection of anything of the kind. Moreover, as a matter of fact, it is not true that if all tithe rent-charges had been varied in or about the year 1872, the result would have been unfavourable to the tithe payer. I have had the figures carefully investigated, and the examination shows that the contrary is really the case. There are 2,450 parishes in Ireland. In 682 parishes the tithes would have been reduced 19 per cent. In 504 they would have been increased 15 per cent. In 1264 no change would have resulted. On the whole, therefore, it appears that if all tithe in Ireland had been revised in 1872 the result would have been to reduce the total amount payable, not to increase it. Looking to all the circumstances of the case, there remains no doubt in my own mind that Mr. Gladstone's idea in stereotyping the tithe rent-charge at that time was to make more simple and definitive the calculations for the redemption of the charge, and that he expected all the payers of ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge to take speedy advantage of the facilities for redemption offered to them. On the other hand, the tithe-payers made no protest against the fixing of the charge, because they did not foresee its possible importance in the future. How should they, seeing the charge had remained unaltered ever since 1838, save in sixty parishes out of 2,450? I submit that it is not reasonable to hold the tithe-payer any longer in bondage to provisions which have ceased to be effective for their original purpose, and which have led to a situation that neither party could have been expected to anticipate. Now, I have nearly completed what I have to say in justification of the principles of the Bill; but before I sit down I will make some reference to the effect these proposals will have upon the Church Fund in the way of impairing its sufficiency to meet the charges laid upon it. This is a practical consideration which we cannot ignore.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Were these calculations made by the Treasury or the Land Commission?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Some of the figures were taken from the Reports of the Land Commission, and some of the calculations I made myself from statistics placed at my disposal by the Land Commission. I may say, generally, that the result of the calculations has been most carefully verified both by the Treasury and by the Land Commission; and I think we may take it that, as far as possible, accuracy has been obtained. At least it is not for want of trouble taken by one side or the other. Now, the reduction of the period of the currency of the terminable annuities will have the effect of reducing the Church Fund by a capital sum of £1,140,000; but this loss will not begin until the year 1917, when the earliest terminable annuities run out. What effect are the proposals of the Bill likely to have on the resources of the Church Fund? By the first proposal, that fund will ultimately lose a capital sum of about £1,140,000, but this loss will not begin until the year 1917. The second proposal of the Bill will result in the immediate loss of an annual sum of about £33,000. This loss will continue for the first fifteen years and may increase in subsequent periods of fifteen years with any additional average reduction of judicial rents. The abolition of the right to redeem the tithe rent-charge will result in a gain to the Church Fund of a capital sum, the exact amount of which it is impossible to state, but which may conceivably be £3,500,000. This gain, however, will not begin to accrue for forty-five years from the present time.

MR. DILLON: Is that based on the supposition that no sales take place?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Yes, that is so. By the fourth proposal of the Bill there will be a gain to the Church Fund of an annual sum of £6,000. Thus it will be seen that the total effect of the alterations proposed by the Bill will be to inflict a substantial loss on the Church Fund, though the exact amount of that loss it is almost impossible to calculate. It is almost impossible to calculate chiefly because, in the first place, we do not know what the average reduction of judicial rents may be in the future; and, secondly, because we cannot say for certain in how many cases tithe rent-charge may be redeemed under the Land Acts. A memorandum I have had prepared shows that up to the year 1947 the Church Fund will not only be able to meet all the liabilities imposed upon it before last year, but will also be able to contribute to the new Department of Agriculture a sum of £70,000. And now I think I am entitled to take up the interruption of the hon. Gentleman, and say that I do not think we need feel very much alarm at an event which is not likely to occur for a generation, and when it does, will not involve a deficiency greater than would be covered by an annual Vote of £20,000 or £30,000. In any case the prospect of such an event is hardly valid ground for opposition to this Bill, which I now ask the House to read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

MR. DILLON: This Bill is alleged to be introduced to remedy a grievance. The Chief Secretary, in introducing a similar measure on the 12th May, 1899,* described it as—

> "A Bill to provide remedies for certain grievances under which the payers of tithe rent-charge at present suffer, and which can only be dealt with by legislation."

This Bill was introduced last year, and again this year, under the ten-minute rule, and no attempt was made by the introducers on either occasion to establish by argument the proposition on which the Bill must be founded that a grievance exists. The only thing approaching to an argument in support of the existence of a grievance is contained in the speech of the Chief Secretary on the 19th June, 1899, when, speaking of the ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge, he said—

> "It must be remembered that the charge is a charge upon rents, and, while rents have been greatly reduced under the supervision of a State tribunal, the rent-charge can no longer be revised."

A most amazing statement, and directly at variance with the facts of the case. Tithe rent-charge in Ireland is not a charge upon rents; it is a charge upon the land having priority over all other charges, except Crown and quit rents. It would be just as correct to describe quit rent, Crown rent, or a head rent under which a large middle interest existed as a charge upon rents, and to argue from that form of expression that there existed an equitable right to demand revision of such quit or head rents, because the rent of the actual occupier was revised in accordance with the fluctuations in the profits of agriculture. I desire to emphasise this point, because there is involved in this argument of the Chief Secretary a most far-reaching principle, and a principle which I hardly think the House will be prepared to accept, namely, that all charges on land are to be treated as charges on rent without regard to priority, and that there exists an equitable claim whenever the rent of the actual occupier is varied to look for a variation of all the charges on the land without regard to priority or the nature of these charges. I do not propose to work out in all its possible developments this principle; but I maintain that if any force be allowed to this argument of the Chief Secretary the consequences I have indicated would flow from it irresistibly. The first ground, then, on which I oppose the Second Reading of this Bill is that, so far as the ecclesiastical tithe-payers are concerned, I deny the existence of a grievance. There is no grievance, and, as no grievance exists, there is no need for a Bill to remove it. And here I must protest in the strongest possible manner against the plan adopted in this Bill of tying up together in one Bill two utterly different and incongruous subjects. The case of the lay tithe-payers is a somewhat complicated one, but they have undoubtedly a plausible case of grievance. All that they ask for is a remedy for a disability under which they labour in consequence of a blunder by the Irish Executive, and for some slight simplification in the law by which they may be able more cheaply to assert their admitted legal rights. What, in the name of common sense, has such a demand as that to do with the demand of the ecclesiastical tithe-payers, which amounts to an outrageous proposal to plunder in the interests of a small class of landowners the last remnant of a public fund set apart by the pious care of our ancestors to provide for the support of the religion of the people, and for the support of the poor; and which, after it had been in course of time diverted from these uses, was solemnly devoted by Act of Parliament to purposes of general public utility? I would beg hon. Members, then, in considering this Bill, always to keep in mind that it deals with two utterly distinct and different subjects — the one the case of the lay tithe-payers, where there is some grievance, and which could be dealt with in a short, simple, and not very contentious Bill; the other, the case of the ecclesiastical tithe-payers—in proposing to deal with which great principles are assailed, propositions of the most contentious character are put forward, and in connection with which I maintain no grievance whatever exists on the part of the tithe-payers beyond that grievance common to a large body of the public, and even to some Members of this House—the failure of one's income to prove equal to one's desire to spend. My second objection to the Bill is that it assails and, so far as it goes, tramples upon a principle which appears to me to be one of the most vital importance in social economy—that a first charge on the land of a country constituting a fund devoted to public objects ought not to be reduced or encroached upon in the interest of individuals or a small class of the population. This is a principle which in theory would, I should think, meet almost universal acceptance in this country, and in practice it ought to guide the proceedings of the Legislature. Yet in this Bill we are asked to violate that principle in a most glaring fashion, without a shred of reason offered us for so doing; and, as I shall presently show, we are asked to violate it under circumstances which would make the violation exceptionally outrageous and indefensible. My third ground of objection is that this is a further step in a long process extending over 170 years—from the day, in 1735, when illegally and by intimidation they did away with the tithe of agistment, down to the introduction of this Bill, by which the Irish landlords have assailed and plundered this public fund, and have, on one plea or another, diverted these charges on the land of Ireland, set aside by immemorial usage for the service of the public, into their own pockets. Fourthly, I object to this Bill because the finance of it is obscure, and if there is one principle more than another which ought, I think, to govern the proceedings of the House of Commons in dealing with measures proposing to tamper with public funds in the interest of individuals, it is that a clear and definite statement of the financial effects of the measure should, on its introduction, be submitted to the House. In the case of this Bill no such statement has been submitted up to this moment, and we are still left in a state of doubt as to the financial effects of the proposals contained in it. Last year, when the Bill was introduced by the Chief Secretary, I asked whether he could give any estimate of the capital loss to the Church Fund which would be caused by the provisions of the Bill. To this question the Chief Secretary replied—

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxi., p. 493.

> "It is very difficult to give a precise estimate, because it would depend upon a great many circumstances which cannot be foreseen. But, before the Bill becomes law, I will endeavour to lay before the House such an estimate as it is possible to make."

Since then, on the 24th July, 1899, a Treasury Memorandum was issued in which no attempt is made to give any answer to the question, what will be the loss caused to the fund by the provisions of the present Bill? When the Tithes Bill was again introduced by the Attorney General this year, observing that he carefully avoided the subject of the financial effect of the Bill, I asked him again, by way of interruption—the only method by which it is possible to ask for information under the ten minutes system—what would be the loss to the Church Fund if the Bill were to pass in its present form. He replied, "About £50,000 a year." Here, then, we are called on to pass a Bill affecting a great public fund in the interests of individuals. The Chief Secretary finds it very difficult to give a precise estimate of the extent to which the fund would be affected by it. The Treasury refuses to try to make an estimate, and the Attorney General thinks the fund would lose about £50,000 a year. I consider it nothing short of a public scandal and a total departure from all previous practice that we should be asked to-day to come to the consideration of the Second Reading of the Bill without, I may say, any information whatever on which proper criticism of the financial effects of the Bill can be based. It may be answered to me, "The Bill is in print, and you see its provisions, and you can make your own calculations." I contend that such a challenge would be entirely opposed to the practice of this House, and I maintain that when the Government introduce a Bill of this character we are entitled to have before us, first their estimate of the financial effects of the proposals in the Bill, and, secondly, such Papers and Returns as may be necessary to enable us to criticise that estimate. I have now specified the four grounds on which I oppose the Second Reading of this Bill, and I turn now to the question of grievance. I have searched all the literature connected with this subject and searched in vain for any rational ground on which the allegation of grievance is based. This charge of tithe is a very ancient charge. It is a charge on the land, and always has been a charge having priority over all liens and charges on the land except quit and Crown rent; from time immemorial all estates in the land have been held and sold subject to that first charge. To establish a grievance in connection with such a charge it is necessary to point to some period when the burden of that charge was unjustly increased, unless, indeed, we are to accept the definition of the landlords' grievance given by the Dublin *Daily Express* in May, 1899, when it said:

> "The landlords suffer an injustice in being required to pay ecclesiastical tithes at all after the Church has been disendowed."

What is that period in the present case? I assert that every change in the system of levying tithes, every new settlement, has been in favour of the land-owning class. How could it have been otherwise, seeing that for the last two centuries, and until after the settlement of 1872, the landowners controlled both Houses of the Legislature? What then, again, I ask, was the period at which this alleged grievance arose? Was it in 1735 when, by the infamous vote of agistment, the Irish House of Commons of that day, in defiance of the law, declared free of tithe the demesnes of the landlords and the pasture lands in the hands of rich Protestant graziers; and, in the words of Grattan, "sent the parson from the demesne of the gentleman to the garden of the cottager"; was it on the 21st March, 1800, when the gentlemen of Ireland, then cheerfully engaged in the work of destroying the liberties of their country for cash and honours, were horrified by Sir John Macartney, who reminded them that the exemption of pasture land in Ireland from tithe was not legal, and rested only on a resolution of the House of Commons and on intimidation; and that if the Union Act were passed, the clergy might sue for their tithe of agistment, and—horror of horrors!—the Protestant gentry and Protestant graziers might be compelled to contribute to the support of their own church. But this reminder proved more potent with these worthies than all the eloquence of Grattan, and Lord Cornwallis was obliged to report to the English Cabinet that the country gentry who were supporting the Union had warned him that they would no longer be able to support it unless an act were passed deing away with the tithe of agistment, and accordingly one of the last Acts of the Irish Parliament was a Tithe Act, setting free gentlemen's demesnes and pasture land from a tithe valued by Sir John Macartney at one million sterling per annum. The next great settlement was that of 1838, the one on which the whole modern system of tithe rent-charge in Ireland rests. Up to that settlement tithe had been levied in the most wasteful and harrowing manner that it is possible, and, as is always the case with such methods of levying an impost, the amount actually received bore a small proportion to the loss inflicted on the payers of tithe. After seventy years of smouldering civil war under the settlement of 1838, the tithe was made payable by the landlord to be levied by him from the occupying tenant as part of his rent. But the amount of the tithe was reduced by 25 per cent. and, taking into account the saving to the occupying tenant of the enormous waste and ruin which resulted from the old methods of levying the tithe, I am convinced that the land-owners of Ireland in the long run benefited under the Settlement of 1838 to the extent of close upon 50 per cent in respect of this charge upon their lands. In support of that view I shall quote two brief extracts from the proceedings of the Commons Committee of 1831-32 on the question of tithe. Sir William Cox was examined before that Committee, and, in reply to question 4962, he stated—

> "He had taken a lease of his tithes being impropriate lay tithes, and put the amount proportionately on his tenants in rent. The tenants most readily agreed and have paid more cheerfully since than they did before, so that they pay the rent and tithe together more readily than they paid the rent alone before."

> "Question 4967: Then, if any deduction had been made to you you would have been a gainer by the transaction?"—"Certainly."

And this is a short extract from the Report of the Committee—

> "Your Committee do not doubt that a fair and liberal deduction from the gross amount of composition would be acquiesced in by the Church in return for the increased security and diminished expenses. It may not be easy to say what precisely the deduction ought to be, but it would perhaps be not unreasonable, looking to the very peculiar circumstances of

Ireland, to assume that it may amount to 15 per cent."

We know that it actually did amount to 25 per cent., and there was no material change in the position of tithe-payers till the Disestablishment of the Church in 1869, and it is in connection with the settlement made on that occasion by the Acts of 1869 and 1872 that the only real attempt has been made on behalf of the Irish landlords to construct a grievance. The settlement of 1869 and 1872 must be taken as a whole, and the question we have to consider is whether, in connection with that settlement, any injustice was inflicted on the landowners of Ireland. If it can be shown that the landowners were treated fairly and even generously in the settlement of 1869–72, and that they accepted that settlement as a generous one, then I say that no subsequent reduction of the rents of the occupiers has any bearing on the question, nor can be alleged with any greater force as a reason for upsetting that settlement than such reductions could be alleged as a reason for the reduction of quit rents or head rents or mortgage interest. Now, what was the settlement of 1869–72? It is contained in Clause 32 of the Church Act of 1869 and in Section 7 of the amending Act of 1872, and briefly stated, it is as follows—

> "All the ecclesiastical tithe-payers were offered the opportunity of purchasing this first charge upon their land at twenty-two and a-half years purchase, and they were allowed, if they so desired, to borrow money from the Government at such a rate as would enable them to pay this purchase money in fifty-two annual instalments of the same amount as the tithe, which they were then actually paying. This arrangement was confirmed in the Act of 1872, and the tithe in the case of those who did not choose to redeem was made invariable."

Now I shall deal first with the terms contained in Clause 32 of the Church Act of 1869. That proposal was universally treated in the House of Commons at the time as a bribe to the landlords to buy off their opposition to the Church Act. It was treated as such by their own leaders and by the spokesmen of their own party, and to show that I do not exaggerate in this description I shall quote from speeches delivered by some of the leaders of the Tory party who were then opposing the Church Act.* In a speech on the Second Reading, Mr. Disraeli used the following language—

> "What do I see in this Bill? Why, that the whole property of the Church of Ireland, generally speaking, will go to the landlords. Well, the landlords have had a slice of that property before; for thirty years they have had £100,000 a year; they have probably had three millions of that property, and what good has it done them? Is the state of Ireland more tranquil or serene, or have they better preserved the institutions to which they were devoted because they for a moment accepted any share of that plunder. And what is it that is now proposed? Why, a scheme which, when we come to investigate it clearly, shows that the whole of the tithe rent-charge is to be absorbed in the land."

In the debate on Clause 32 the Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Sullivan, afterwards Lord Chancellor, said—

> "The quit rent was redeemed in Ireland at twenty-five years purchase; why, then, should the tithe rent-charge not be redeemed at twenty-two and a half years purchase?"

In the same debate on Clause 32 the present Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks Beach) said—

> "In his opinion the proposal of the Government combined sacrilege with bribery. These were strong words, but nothing less strong would express his feelings. He believed it was sacrilege because it was taking away from the Church property to which the State had no right, and devoting it to secular purposes and bribery; also because it was admitted to secure the consent of the landlords by handing over to them the property upon terms making the transfer a gift and not a sale.'

Sir Frederick Heygate said—

> "This discussion was a most humiliating squabble for Irish landlords to be engaged in. He quite agreed with his hon. friend Sir Michael Hicks Beach that the clause was nothing less than bribery and sacrilege. The Irish landlords were, in fact, asked to take a bribe and assist the Government to pass the Bill."

Mr. Fawcett protested against the clause, and said—

> "If this clause were passed, at the end of fifty-two years Parliament proposed to make a present to the landlords of Ireland of £8,500,000, provided they would commute the tithe rent-charge. He had consulted distinguished members of the House about it, and they said: 'We know it is making an enormous present to Irish landlords, but we must do something to grease the wheels, to conciliate hostility and buy off opposition.'"

Sir Frederick Heygate said what the Irish landlords were asked to do was to take a bribe and assist the Government to pass the Bill. Whatever may be said as to their assistance to the Government to pass the Bill, they had no hesitation about the bribe, for when it come to Clause 32 the Irish landlords were found solid for the clause, and the division is so interesting I must read out some of the names. For the clause there voted Bagwell, Ball, Viscount Burke, Lord Castlerosse, the Hon. Mr. Dawson, De la Poer, Lord Otho Fitz-Gerald, Colonel French, Lord Galway, Captain Greville, Colonel Greville Nugent, Arthur McMurrough Kavanagh, Pollard - Urquhart, Lord St. Lawrence, Rt. Hon. S. Sullivan, Colonel Vandeleur; while with Mr. Fawcett against the clause there voted, to their honour be it said, Sir Michael Hicks Beach and William Johnston. By the Act of 1872, as I have already said, tithes were made invariable in the case of those who declined to redeem under Clause 32. This change was made without one word of protest on the part of the Irish landlords, who, at that time, controlled the majority of the Irish representation in this House; and it is very easy to understand why it was so readily accepted. The right of varying tithe had never, I believe, been very extensively used in Ireland. In most cases the tithe had not been varied for a considerable time. Prices and rents had been, and were, rising, and the landlords very probably felt that a variation of the tithes would lead to considerable increases. But there was another reason for the acceptance of this settlement without protest. The settlement of the Act of 1872 must be considered together with that contained in Clause 32 of the Act of 1869 as one settlement; and part of that settlement was the right to redeem on such terms that without any increase of annual payment the tithe would cease altogether and become absorbed in the land after fifty-two years. This was the settlement which had been described by Mr. Disraeli as one under which "virtually the whole property of the Church will go to the landlords." Is it not, then, an almost inconceivable instance of audacity to set up a claim of grievance in connection with a settlement giving such advantages as were given to the Irish landlords under the Acts of 1869 and 1872? Yet it is solely on the provisions of this settlement that the attempt is made to establish a case of grievance and to justify the introduction of the present Bill. I have stated, as a second ground for opposing this Bill, that in it great principles are violated, and in support of that statement I refer to the Treasury Memorandum first published in June, 1895, and re-issued after the change of Government in August, 1895, and signed by the present Secretary to the Treasury. In July, 1894, Lord Belmore moved in the House of Lords for a Return giving answers to five questions, of which the fifth question reads as follows—

---

* For Second Reading Debates on the Irish Church Bill (1869) see *The Parliamentary Debates* [Third Series], Vol. cxciv. For Debate on Clause 32, see Vol. cxcvi.

> "On what grounds have the Treasury declined to act upon the recommendation of the Irish Land Commissioners that tithe rent-charge vested in the Irish Land Commission should in future be made redeemable at twenty instead of twenty-two and a half years purchase under the provisions of Section 15 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887?"

It was explained to Lord Belmore that the information could not be given in the form in which he asked for it; but that an endeavour would be made to supply such information as the Treasury possessed in some other form. Owing to a misunderstanding between Lord Belmore and the representatives of the Government, no further action was taken in the session of 1894, but the question was revived in March, 1895, and an undertaking was given on behalf of the Government that an explanatory memorandum on the subject should be prepared for presentation to Parliament. On the 27th June, 1895, this memorandum was circulated, and here is the reply of the Treasury to the fifth question of Lord Belmore—

> "The Land Commissioners have recommended that in such cases the terms of redemption of the perpetual tithe should be reduced from twenty-two-and-a-half years purchase, the rate prescribed by the Acts of 1869 and 1872, to twenty years purchase, but the Treasury have not felt justified in concurring in this proposal. The primary reason which led this Board and their predecessors"—

I would ask the House to note that, as it is an all-important point—

> "to that conclusion was the very serious loss which this proposal, and the consequences which might be apprehended from it, would inflict on the Church fund. The possible amount of that loss was estimated by the Land Commission in 1888 at £845,000, supposing the concession limited to the tithe only, without application to other portions of the Church property; and it may be taken as certain that no such amount could now be surrendered without serious risk to the solvency of the Church fund. Other considera-

tions, however, affecting the proposal on its merits cannot be overlooked, two of which the First Lord may place on record :—

"(1) It is in effect a compulsory reduction of the (statutory) value of one particular charge on the land—namely, that held in trust for Irish public purposes, unaccompanied by any suggestion of reduction in other and less will-secured charges such as mortgages. Measuring the security of a charge by the rate of interest which it carries this proposal would treat the tithe as a 5 per cent. charge, and, therefore, as being no better secured than mortgages carrying 5 per cent. interest, and worse secured than those carrying 4½ per cent. As all such mortgages are posterior to tithe the First Lord thinks that the statutory price of twenty-two-and-a-half years purchase, implying interest at 4½ per cent., is not illiberal to the tithe-payer in view of the ordinary rates of interest on mortgages on Irish land.

"(2) This proposal to treat the tithe as no better secured than a 5 per cent. chargo is in striking contrast to the suggestion that loans from the Church Fund on precisely the same security should be made at a rate not exceeding 3½ or even 3 per per cent., which rates involve a high estimate of the security. It would be extremely illogical, apart from other objections, to apply simultaneously both these methods of relieving the tithe-payer at the cost of the Church Fund.

"In conclusion, the First Lord desires to remark that he has endeavoured in this memorandum to distinguish between the matters for which the Board is, and those for which it is not, responsible. In the case of the former, it is their Lordships' duty to defend their own decisions ; but as to the latter, it is only necessary to state facts and figures for the consideration of the Legislature."

From this memorandum it is clear that the Treasury, constituted as it was in June, 1895, and carrying out the policy of its predecessors in the previous Government, had refused to make this concession, and refused it on the double ground of public policy and economic principle ; because, in the first instance, the loss to the Church Fund would be too heavy, and because, in the second place, the principle of reducing a first charge on the land while inferior liens were left untouched, was a principle vicious in itself. I know that I shall be told that this policy was reversed, and that within six months the Treasury did exercise its right to make the concession asked for in case of estates that were sold to the tenants by the Land Commission; and, furthermore, that this alteration of policy was confirmed by Clause 37 of the Bill of 1896. But in reply I point out that no justification for this sudden and extraordinary change of policy on the part of the Treasury was ever laid before the House, and when, in the spring of 1896, I asked the Secretary of the Treasury on what grounds he could explain this change in policy, he replied that the only ground was a change in the *personnel* of the Treasury, a reply which appeared to me at the time, and appears to me still, as most degrading to a great Department of the State, for it will be evident that the memorandum from which I have just quoted must have been prepared and issued with the full approval of the permanent heads of the Treasury ; and yet, within six months, without any fresh statement of grounds for a change of policy, the action which is declared by this reasoned memorandum to be against public policy and principle, was sanctioned by the Treasury. Before I pass from the Treasury memorandum of 1895, I wish to draw attention to one statement made by Lord Belmore, and admitted in the memorandum, and that is that the recommendation to reduce the redemption price of tithe rent-charge was made by the Land Commission. Now this is not a fact. I find that in a judgment delivered by Mr. Commissioner O'Brien on the 10th June, 1896, the following statement occurs—

"But now by letter dated 5th May last, the Treasury has authorised the Land Commission to reduce the rate of redemption for tithe rent charge to twenty years purchase, and for tithe annuities to the basis of a forty-five instead of fifty-two years annuity. The Treasury letter is in answer to one from the secretary of the Land Commission asking for permission to make this reduction. That letter, however, was misleading. It purports to have been written by the direction of the Commissioners, whereas it was written by the direction of but one Commissioner. It naturally conveyed to the Treasury that this matter had again been considered by the whole Commission, and that the proposed change in the rate of redemption was approved by all or the majority of the Land Commissioners. On this, as on other occasions, a communication was made in the name of the Land Commissioners without my authority, assent, or knowledge, relating to an important matter which, in my opinion, should have been brought before the full Board."

That is a monstrous thing. Here we have an important letter sent to the Treasury, without the knowledge or assent of the Commissioners, by one of the most important members of that Commission. But all the concessions made by the Treasury letter of 1896 and Clause 37 of the Land Act of 1896—

enormous as they are in amount—apply only to the case of estates sold to the tenants under the Land Purchase Act. And I can conceive it being argued that, where so great a public object is arrived at as the transfer of the land in Ireland to the occupiers, it is permissible to hand over this large slice of a public fund to the landlords, by way of greasing the wheels, although I confess that the amount of grease required to keep the Irish landlords moving is positively alarming. But, whatever force there may be in that argument, it has no weight in support of this Bill, which proposes to extend similar concessions and advantages to those landlords who decline to sell as have already been given to landlords, by way of an inducement or a bribe, to sell their estates, and by doing so co-operate in carrying out what is now recognised by every one to be a great object of public policy in Ireland. The landlords are not to be asked for any concession or *quid pro quo* for the enormous sum of money which it is proposed to hand over to them. With my third ground of objection I have already dealt, and I now desire to say a few words more as to the financial effect of the Bill. I have already shown that we have got little or no light from the Government on this part of the subject. On the 12th May last year, in his speech introducing this Bill, the Chief Secretary said—

> " Any attempt to strike the balance of gain and loss must be to some extent speculative, but on the supposition that if this Bill did not pass, full and immediate advantage were to be taken of the present right to redeem by all ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge payers, the Church Fund would probably be worse off than if our proposals were adopted."

Commenting upon this, the *Daily Express* most truly says—

> " As the tithes are paid to the Church Fund, it is absolutely impossible by any manipulation of finance to give relief to landlords without diminishing the fund."

There could not be a better illustration of the obscurity in which this important question has been left. Now what is the exact nature of the demands made on behalf of the ecclesiastical tithe-payers, and to what extent are these demands met by the provisions of this Bill? As a statement of the claims of the tithe-payer, I shall read an extract from a pamphlet published on their behalf last year. It says—

> " The injustice of the case, as affecting the tithe-payers in Ireland, who practically may be identified with the landlords, is beyond dispute. The tithe-payers demand that they should be treated fairly, and that the exceptional law passed in 1872 should be repealed, and that the tithes should be varied annually, and in the simple and inexpensive way that tithes are varied in England; and that credit should be given for those over-payments which have been made.
>
> " Also, they demand that the artificial value of twenty-two and a half years purchase, established by the Church Amendment Act of 1872, should be reduced, and that tithes should be redeemable, when varied, at twenty years purchase.
>
> " As to the tithes which have been converted into annuities, the annuitants complain that the bargain has been broken, and that in their case alone (as affecting land legislation) a contract, made when prices were high, has been considered sacred. Their rents, their rights, and their position have been altered by legislation, while they themselves have had to pay to the very last shilling the amount fixed in 1872. Added to this, the orignal bargain was unjust; where tenants who have purchased their holdings under similar conditions have to pay only forty-nine instalments, the tithe annuitants under the Church Act have to pay fifty-two."

It will be observed that this claim is of a twofold character. First, there is the claim of those tithe-payers who have not redeemed to have their rent-charges made variable, and when varied redeemable at twenty years purchase of the reduced charge, instead of, as at present, at twenty-two and a half years purchase of the unreduced charge. This claim is partially met by the Bill, which proposes to vary the tithe rent-charge every fifteen years in proportion to the variation of the rent of the occupier, and to make that variable tithe irredeemable. But I do not understand from Clause 4 that it is proposed to take away from the Irish Land Commission the right which they exercise under Section 15 of the Land Act of 1887 to order the redemption of any tithe rent-charges. And one point on which I should like to have information is whether it is contemplated that, after the tithe rent has been varied, the redemption price in the case of sales in the Land Commission Court is to be twenty years of the reduced tithe rent-charge. The second demand is of an even more outrageous character. It is the demand of those tithe-payers who purchased their tithes under the terms offered in Clause 32 of the Church Act, and have voluntarily changed the tithe rent-charge into a fixed and terminable annuity in terms denounced by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer as constituting a monstrous bribe to the landlords of Ireland. And this demand it is proposed in the Bill to meet by remitting seven annual instalments. There is not much obscurity about this proposal. In its audacity it stands naked and apparently unashamed. A feeble attempt has been made to make out that there was some miscalculation or misunderstanding by those in charge of the financial proposals of the Church Bill. There is not a shadow of justification for this statement. It has been completely disposed of by the Treasury Memorandum of 1895. The simple fact is that, having digested the sacrilegious bribe of 1869, these gentlemen are now hungry for another meal. In the Report on the Church Temporalities for the year ending 30th March, 1899, the revenue from fixed annual instalments on redeemed tithes is £163,688, so that, under this provision alone it is proposed ultimately to present the landlords with over a million of money. For a number of years the policy of British Ministers in Ireland has been to govern that country by a mixture of bribery and coercion, a policy which has naturally earned for them the contempt of all Irishmen. This Bill is simply a proposal to give another bribe to the so-called Loyalists of Ireland. If it is passed, the Government will receive neither respect nor gratitude for their gift. No Chief Secretary has ever obtained more money for the Irish landlords than the present holder of that office, yet we have all read in a recent copy of Lord Ardilaun's newspaper—the *Dublin Daily Express*—a communication in which an indignant Irish loyalist declares that—

> "Never since James the Second sent over Dick Talbot to disarm the Protestant gentry of Ireland and leave them at the mercy of their enemies has there come from England so mischievous an administrator as Mr. Gerald Balfour."

I would, then, advise the Government to abandon the futile effort to satisfy the ravening maw of Irish landlordism, to withdraw this Bill, and to prepare some scheme under the provisions of which what remains of the Irish Church Fund may be devoted to purposes of general public utility, such as reinstating the evicted tenants, endowing a university for the people of Ireland, and other public objects for which money is urgently needed in so poor a country as Ireland. I beg to move "that this Bill be read a second time this day six months."

MR. T. M. HEALY: After listening to the admirable speech of my hon. friend, I have great pleasure in seconding this motion. I do so substantially upon grounds similar to those put forward by the hon. Member for East Mayo, although my arguments will be somewhat different. I quite agree with my hon. friend when he declares that the Government have not really considered, in principle, the far-reaching character of their proposal. I assert that a greater blow to the principle of property or to the principle of the stability of financial institutions has never been struck than by the introduction of this Bill, which is as revolutionary as if it had issued from a backwoods Parliament, or from one of the newly erected institutions in Bloemfontein or Pretoria. The hon. Member for East Mayo has already shown by his historical retrospect that the Irish landlords have no grievance, but I will found my argument upon the assumption that they have a grievance, and that having that grievance this is the worst of all possible means by which it could be redressed. Let me first consider this point from the tenants' side of the question. The amount of reduction is to be based on the judicial rents, but what does that mean for the tenant? In future the Irish Land Commission, which is the guardian of the Irish Church surplus — and which is at the same time the axe of execution to the landlords—will have to consider in any reduction they make of the rents that the basis upon which they are fixing them will involve the destruction of the fund of which they have been constituted the legal guardians. Therefore, when Mr. Justice Madden was declaring that someone should have a reduction of 30 per cent., he must have been conscious that at the same time in giving that reduction he was striking a blow at his own trusteeship. That is an immoral position in which to put a Judge of the Irish Land Commission. If you constitute a man the trustee of a given fund, and then make him the destroyer of that fund, you place him in a position which is absolutely irreconcilable if you make him guilty of a breach of trust. When you do that with a Judge in a judicial position, he is put in a situation in which no Judge in the land ought to be placed. In the county of Monaghan, which county I represented at one time in this House, and with whose daily life I was to some extent familiar, oats had not fallen in value to the same extent as wheat and other produce. What is the position of the recipient of the charge? He will find that whereas the rents in County Monaghan have been reduced 30 per cent., and oats have fallen only 15 per cent. in consequence of judicial rents, the result is that the landlords have been made a present of 15 per cent. more than they were otherwise fairly entitled to. What is the great basis of rent reduction in Ireland? We have never gone so much upon the question of price at all. We have stood upon this impregnable ground—which is admitted by every English statesman who has considered it—that the tenant of Ireland is the person who should benefit by improvements in the soil, and that the kernel of the land Act is that no rent shall be payable on any improvements effected by the tenants. The tenant himself puts up all the farm buildings, fences and gates, and makes all the reforms, and does everything that is necessary to make the farm profitable, and now, because his rent has been reduced, the landlord's tithe is to be reduced accordingly, although they have done nothing to warrant them getting this reduction, which is made upon the basis of the tenant's improvements. Therefore the landlord is allowed to walk off with half the swag because the tenant has made the improvements in the soil. Was there ever heard of in connection with a Bill of this kind so false and fatal a principle? How are we going to deal with the middleman? I should like to know where the middlemen are going to be left in this question. It is admitted that, if a man has a head rent of £50 a year and it is swept away, he has a grievance, but is he to remain under that grievance, whereas the payer of tithe—the spoiled child of both the Irish and English Parliaments—is to get a further reduction on the ground that his rents have been reduced? He may not be the head renter at all, and he may not be a person on whose estates fair rents have been fixed. Is this Bill to make no distinction in such cases? Supposing I, as a landlord, have been successful on various grounds in preventing my tenants from going into the Land Courts, is this Bill to make no distinction in such a case; and is its hyssop to fall both on the just and the unjust? I should like further to ask this question. Supposing a person has become a landlord since 1881, as is constantly occurring through the Landed Estates Court, where Irish and English insurance companies are foreclosing their mortgages, is no distinction to be made? Only the other day the Hand-in-Hand Insurance Company grabbed an entire estate out of the hands of the landord. Some of the mortgagees were the tenants themselves. One produced a note showing that he had lent £2,000 to the landlord, but he could not recover a single penny. Are the Hand-in-Hand Insurance Company to get the benefit of this Bill, and to draw money from this impoverished Irish Fund, although they have only become Irish landlords in the course of the last few months? I do not think the Government have considered the very beginning of this question. I say it is a monstrous thing that an insurance company which becomes the landlord of an estate, against the wishes of the tenants, should have relief under this Bill. Now I come to another point. We had here two years ago a question in which the right hon. Gentleman the Solicitor-General for England was deeply interested—and I am most happy to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon his elevation to his present position. We had the question of the Irish National teachers and the deficit which it was said had arisen in the Teachers' Pension Fund on account of a Treasury error. It was admitted that the British Government had held out to these teachers that if they paid sums out of their little salaries varying from £2 to £3 per annum they would be entitled at the end of long and laborious service to pensions according to their class, of £40, £50, £60, or £70 a year, to be charged upon this very Irish Church Fund. How did the Government deal with the National teachers, and by what methods were their grievances redressed? The Government fed the dog with a bit of its own tail. Why do they not give the Irish landlords a similar diet? Remember, the National teachers are men of whom it cannot be said that "they toil not, neither do they spin." They were told, "Oh, the Treasury have made a mistake." The Act was passed by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer when he was Irish Secretary, I think in 1875, and he then said that the Treasury were so accurate that there was no possibility of a mistake. Yes, the Treasury is always accurate to-day—it is only yesterday it makes mistakes. At any rate, the Treasury made a mistake of a paltry million, and these poor teachers, who had been swindled for twenty years, were told that they could not have the pensions which had been guaranteed to them by statute. John Bull went back on his word, although we are told that British credit is secure all over the world, and the teachers were compelled to provide out of their own pockets for a mistake of the Treasury. And what was the comfort you gave them? They were told, "You will be allowed at your own expense to commence an action in the High Courts againt Her Majesty, and we will defend it with all the resources at our command." The unworthy task was put upon the Attorney General for Ireland of having to defend the misconduct of the Treasury, with the result that the Courts in Ireland gave judgment in favour of the Crown, and the Irish teachers who were promised these pensions are now living witnesses to the fraud and bad faith of the British Government. They are working in Ireland to bring up the Irish children, and to teach them sometimes to sing "God save the Queen," and their reward is to be told by the Treasury, "You can borrow money from a bank, but we are no longer responsible." They were your faithful servants in Ireland, they were part of your machinery of progress and civilisation, and this is how they were treated. What, on the other hand, do you owe to the Irish landlords? Yet you rob the national teachers, and now propose to give a million and a half to the Irish landlords, to whom you owe nothing, and who turned Ireland at one time into a bloody puddle, and still keep it in a welter of confusion. We know, according to the landlords of Ireland, that the British Government is—not only in regard to themselves, but in regard to their Church—a government of spoliation, and they now want a little of the funds of the Church in order to make up for the robbery of themselves. Will they use this money for buying stained glass windows for Protestant churches? Will they put up spires on these somewhat dilapidated cathedrals in which they worship? Nothing of the kind; they will spend the money in horse-racing in England, or at Monte Carlo. That is where the sacrilegious plunder of the Irish Church is to go, and the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, who is responsible for this Bill, was the very Minister who declared that the conduct of the landlords in swallowing the Church Act of 1869 was a disgrace to their class. Now I come to consider what the grievances of the landlords are. Apparently they have one sole grievance, and I will make them a present of it. That is in reference to lay tithe. The Irish Courts have decided that because the *Dublin Gazette* did not continue to print columns of corn statistics, there were no means of revising the tithe. I have always sympathised with the editor of the *Dublin Gazette*; he is the one journalist who is always entitled to my sympathy, and I suppose he was so busy printing coercion proclamations that, in the language of Fleet Street, his columns were "crowded out," and he had no room for printing the corn returns. I admit the landlords have a grievance, but if there had been fewer proclamations there would have been more corn returns. We were deprived of the right of *habeas corpus* in Ireland by these proclamations, and the landlords were deprived of the revision of tithe. I think we were the worse off, but I think also that if these corn returns in the *Dublin Gazette*, and even if the *Gazette* itself disappeared, Ireland as a whole would not be sorry. I should have thought that if there were this intense grievance the Irish landlords would not have been content merely with the decision of the Irish Courts, and that they would have taken to the House of Lords—a somewhat sympathetic tribunal—the question as to whether this decision with reference to the *Dublin Gazette* was technically correct or not. But this grievance did not weigh upon noble Lords and others to such an extent as to induce them to find a couple of hundred pounds to lodge an appeal in the House of Lords, in order to test this question, and accordingly the landlords were deprived of the right of having this lay tithe revised. Again and again questions upon that subject were put in this

House, not from the landlord benches, but from these benches; again and again we asked the Government to repair this error of the editor of the *Dublin Gazette*, but the Government always refused. What do the Government do now? They harness to that undoubted, or at all events arguable, grievance this car of spoliation, and make what is merely the correction of a slight error in procedure the vehicle by which we are to be robbed of nearly two millions sterling. Do they suppose that a proceeding of that kind is likely to commend this Bill or their conduct to the general body of Irish tenants? How often have we pressed for corrected procedure with regard to the Land Acts, but that had to be wrung from the Government by bloodshed. I acknowledge that the present Government for the first time passed in 1896 a Bill without an appeal to disorder. But I am speaking of British government as a whole, and I say that never have the Irish tenants succeeded in winning any correction of any error of procedure through which they have been damnified except through the avenue of turmoil, agitation, and disorder. The Irish landlords now put up their claims, and not only say that this error must be corrected, but that they are to get a bonus of one and a half millions of sacrilegious plunder in addition. I maintain that if the landlords have a grievance in this matter, that grievance should be rectified out of the general Treasury Fund. Who will be paying by and by for the losses in Natal and the loss of the missionaries in China? We were told to-day that Indian troops had been sent to China at the Imperial expense. I want to know—when the general Treasury Fund is to be saddled with those charges—why the Irish Fund is to be saddled with charges which, from your point of view, are really part of your Imperial policy? It was your Imperial policy that abolished the Brehon laws, and that gave us as our masters the territorial aristocracy. Why, then, if they exist as the garrison in Ireland, should they not draw Imperial wages, and not seek compensation out of this Irish Fund? I have never forgotten the speech made by the present President of the Local Government Board on the Irish Land Bill of 1881. He said that the Government were engaged in reversing an Imperial policy; he asked what had made Irish land worthless; and he added that it was the selfish policy of English manufacturers in Ireland, who destroyed Irish industries and left nothing for the people but the land, and now, he continued, the Government were making the Imperial garrison bear the expense which should fall on the Imperial taxpayer. I believe there is a great deal to be said for the Irish landlords from that point of view. Why do they not come down to this House in khaki? That is the position they ought to take up. Let them appear as members of the Imperial garrison in Ireland, and say, "Ever since the days of Elizabeth and Cromwell we have acted as your garrison in Ireland; now pay us our wages." That would be a fair and reasonable position. What was the initiation of this Bill? You abolished the Brehon laws in the days of Elizabeth—and to us the days of Elizabeth are as close as the days of Victoria. There is no yesterday in Ireland; and those times and consequences are as much alive in that country to-day, and as much a living reality, as what is passing in this country before your own eyes. You grabbed our churches and put them into the hands of Protestants, and you were not content with robbing our churches but you also slaughtered and banished our priests, and put upon us a ministry many of whom were perverts of the vilest type. When you had done all that, you declared that the Irish landlords in future should be made to pay these tithes, and that they should no longer fall on the Catholic tenants. What did you do then? In a series of statutes you took away from the tenants the nominal burden of the tithe, but you increased the landlord's power of eviction, and from that time onward the position of the occupier of the soil became more defenceless, because every effort that human ingenuity could devise was, as O'Connell showed in one of his famous speeches, put forward to deprive these tenants of any protection, and at last the landlord succeeded in adding the tithe to the rent. We have given you your religion free for three hundred years, and also your churches, almost every one of which was erected by Catholic hands and as the result of Catholic piety. I have no doubt that in Belfast and some other places in the north there may be Protestant churches, but for the most part the churches were grabbed from the Catholics. In several places the churches were burned, and, of course, if you burn a church you cannot have it, and if you did not burn the church you have got it. What was the final stage in this dismal history, this squalid mixture of religion and lucre? The final stage was the Act of 1869. The Poor Law Act was put into operation in the thirties, and an enormous burden was placed upon the occupier. Then followed the famine, when millions of our people were driven out. You provided as a boon to the tenants that half the rates should be paid by the landlord. The occupier was defenceless; he was a man without a lease and without tenure, and the half poor rate was added to his rent just as the tithe was added. Two years ago we relieved the landlords from the poor rates, and we relieved them from the county cess in cases of tenancies created since the Act of 1870. I myself have never regretted that, because it was part of a great system of domestic reform. The landlords have now escaped from all the burdens which accompany the territorial position in other countries, and how are you going to open this blessed new century? Having freed the landlords from every burden which accompanies territorial rights, you give them, as a final boon, 25 per cent. reduction in tithe rent-charge, amounting to one and a half millions. You do that at the very time when you are setting up an Agricultural Department in Ireland, the chief use of which, as far as I can understand, is to make rents in Ireland better payable than in the past, and to make the Irish tenant a surer mark for your demands. Oh, that is denied; and it is said that you are going to create new industries in Ireland, where you will not even buy the uniforms of your policemen or soldiers, or boots and shoes for a single one of the instruments of your own despotism. You admit that wheat has decreased, and with the absence of wheat milling has disappeared, with a number of other industries. Having abolished every industry by which the people of the unhappy country lived you have set up a new Department to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, and to make every cow give three times as much milk as she ever gave before. What is the security for this new Agricultural Department? It is this very Irish Church Fund which is being robbed in advance in the interests of the landlord. These are the prudent administrators—the vigilant watch dogs of the Treasury! These are the financial gods whom the Irish must bow down to and worship! We have no Parliament in Ireland; but we come over here to learn the trade; and what an example! We find that the British Treasury, which should, above all things, be governed by fixed and rigid principles, is not only attacking the principle of property and the principle of finance, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had declared that any attempt to deal with this fund in the way proposed was sacrilegious plundering, and who put his name to a statement on one day that the British Treasury would find it incompatible with their financial principles to sanction anything of the kind, now as a mere sop to the indignation of the landlords has flung all these financial principles to the winds. It is said that there is a continuity in the government of Ireland. That is true in one respect—there is a continuity of fraud. With regard to every other form of fraud that has been perpetrated there has been some attempt at justification, but here we are asked to swallow the nauseating dose wholesale, without even the usual spoonful of jam. I can well understand the Irish landlords and the Irish Government saying, "Look here, you naked Irish, there is a fund of two or three millions out of which the British Treasury is making some £50,000 or £60,000 a year. Here it is in our Imperial power, and we are going to grab it." I do not know what this Irish Church Fund is. I have never seen it. We would never know it if we saw it, especially after this Bill. I suppose it is a legend, and that the Treasury has some enormous book, with an enormous clerk, drawing an enormous salary for entering enormous figures in that enormous book. That is the Irish Church Fund! I do not suppose it is anything else than carrying figures from one account in this ledger to another, and bringing in a debit to Ireland of £50,000 a year—the British Government being able to make a large profit out of the transaction. I can understand the landlords saying to the tenants, "Look you, we have been robbing you for a long time, and we have been robbed by the Treasury. We have a grievance. The Chief Secretary is not popular. We even gather that from the *Daily Express*; so he is called Dick Talbot the second. We have lost a great deal by these Land Acts, and you have not gained as much as you think. There has been a long eviction campaign. We have had a squabble with you over that. But let us both join and rob the Saxon Treasury. You give us half a million, and we shall give you another half." I understand that is the deal; but that is not the basis on which it is put at all. If the Government came and said, "Can you, out of consideration for Lord Ardilaun, and all those other interesting 'porter peers' whom we have got on our hands, see your way to agree to give them a share of the Irish Church Surplus Fund, and we will agree to give you some of the balance?" that is a reasonable proposal. But that the Irish people should be asked to give the Irish landlords, at the moment you are establishing a fund for agricultural purposes, a sum of £1,500,000 is, I think, the most audacious and impudent proposal that I have ever heard of emanating from a British Government. I therefore venture to suggest to hon. Gentlemen opposite to make a fair transaction in this matter. There are in Ireland—nobody denies it—a number of cases of unjust eviction, and of deplorable hardship. I go this length, that if you allocate, say, one half of this fund, and appoint a tribunal of, say, the hon. Member for Ennis and the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, I would be willing to leave the administration of the money in their hands, so that it went to these poor people. That is not the offer that is made to us. But here is a Government which has given us an Agricultural Grant—which went to England temporarily to one class, but half of it is going in Ireland for ever to the relief of one class—which is going to turn round and give that class an additional bribe in order that they may obtain their support. I say that a policy of that kind is not founded on reason. It is a policy which will re-act upon the Administration itself, and I certainly say that it should have come from a Government enjoying the unparalleled popularity which we are told is the result of their South African policy—an unparalleled popularity proved by the fact that it commands a majority of 150 in this House—shows that the British Constitution has been put up to a kind of Dutch auction. In former times you went to the polls, and you declared yourselves on certain great principles, like the ballot, or workmen's compensation; on questions which stirred mankind like the education or the religious question; but nowadays the policy of the Government is a policy of "shin-plasters." You find out a particular class which is aching to receive public money, and instantly you proceed to shovel out the public money to that class. Where is the demand for this Bill? From what avenue or canal has it proceeded? Who has asked for it? You have refused it again and again in the House of Lords when it was pressed for by Lord Belmore, and others. I have never heard it urged for by hon. Gentlemen opposite, who ably represent their class. It is usually the case in this House not to put a question into Bill shape until it has been hammered on the anvil of resolutions and debate. This Bill appears to have sprung out of a headache in the Irish Office. Has the right hon. Gentleman got tired of being called names? He does not like being called Dick Talbot the Second. He wants the reputation of a judicious banker of the necessities of the Irish people. I can only say that a Bill which in reality attacks the finance and the principles of the Treasury, as laid down by successive Administrations for over forty years, is a very bad one with which to face a General Election.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I certainly should have thought, after the two speeches which we have just heard from the hon. Member for East Mayo and the hon. Member who has just sat down, that the Government would have attempted at least some reply. I can see no answer, I confess, to those speeches. We have had in this country, certainly upon these benches, complaints of a policy of doles, but this is carrying the policy of doles to an extent almost of madness. I have never heard of a Bill which has filled me with more astonishment and, from a financial point of view, with more indignation, than the Bill now under the consideration of the House. What is the meaning of this Bill? We have not had from the Chief Secretary for Ireland any statement of what he expects the landlords of Ireland are to receive out of this Bill; but it is quite plain that when that sum is ascertained, the amount which will be lost to the Irish Church Fund will be lost to the British Exchequer, which is ultimately responsible for the solvency of the Church Fund. The views of the English Treasury on this subject have been read out by the hon. Member for East Mayo in the minute for which I accept my share of responsibility. It is there pointed out that the proposal at that time might lead, and probably would lead, to the insolvency of the Irish Church Fund. But these proposals are not identical with that made at that time, although the principles involved are exactly the same. How can the Chief Secretary for Ireland undertake to say that this proposal may not or will not involve danger to the solvency of the Irish Church Fund? That is the point of view which at least the English Treasury and the English taxpayer care for. The Irish Church Fund is a national fund applicable to national purposes; and the Irish people have a right to look at all public funds from that point of view; and you have no right to appropriate such a fund to the purposes of one particular class. I do not care what particular form this question assumes; it is dealing with a public fund for the sole and exclusive purposes of one particular class. This first clause, which reduces the annuity from fifty-two to forty-five years, involves a certain sum of money, which I do not know to be accurately stated by the Chief Secretary for Ireland; but before this Fund is dealt with we ought to have in pounds, shillings, and pence exactly what the Fund is. That has never yet been stated, and the notion of seizing a public fund—which is a fund for the benefit, in the first instance, of the people of Ireland, and for which ultimately the English Treasury and the Consolidated Fund is responsible—without stating how far the solvency of that Fund is affected——

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I am sorry to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but the statement was given in the memorandum of the Treasury which was laid on the Table of the House last year.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Is that the figure at which the Fund now stands?

Is that the amount from which it is now proposed to make the grant to the Irish landlords?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The memorandum shows the condition in which the Fund will be left if these proposals are carried out.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: But what we want to know is the actuarial value of the gift you make to the Irish landlords, and then we can judge of the amount of the dole, and what is the justification for that dole. In the early part of this debate I observed the Chancellor of the Exchequer was present, when the hon. Member for East Mayo quoted some very strong expressions the right hon. Gentleman had made use of in regard to the proposals in this Bill; but he is no longer here. I should like to know what are his views in regard to this Bill, and how he distinguishes it from those proposals which he formerly denounced so justly. It seems to me an extraordinary thing. We have heard of a policy of continuity, but anything more absolutely reversing the financial policy of the English Treasury it is impossible to conceive. The principles laid down in the memorandum of 1895 are, as the hon. Member for East Mayo and the hon. and learned Gentleman who succeeded him said, absolutely inconsistent with this Bill. It is quite unnecessary for me to repeat the arguments which have been so well put forward by the hon. Gentlemen who have spoken from below the gangway. I enter my protest against the Bill as utterly unsound financially, and as being a gross injustice to the Irish people, who have a right to the integrity of the Irish Church Fund, as far as it will go, for national purposes. That fund is not to be frittered away for the benefit of a particular class in Ireland, any more than the public funds of this country can be disposed of for the benefit of a particular class. I do not desire at this hour unnecessarily to delay the House, but I express the hope that this Bill will be fully debated before it is allowed to pass into law, so that its real bearing and character may be thoroughly understood. A more serious attack on the financial principles on which public funds ought to be dealt with has never, in my opinion, been made in this House. I regret very much the absence of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, as we should know what are his sentiments on such a departure from sound financial principles. There is another point of which I will briefly take notice, and that is the Bill as it affects property. I entirely agree with the hon. Member for East Mayo in what he said as to its effects on the security of all property. It is alleged that the Irish landlords have suffered from a reduction of their rents, and what is the remedy? To attack the first rent-charge on the property, to impoverish the fund belonging to the Irish people, and to impair the security of the British Treasury. I observe that there are other charges on the land that the Bill does not affect, and those are the second charges. We ought to know to what extent you are damaging the first rent-charge on this property in order to indemnify people simply because their rents have fallen. That is a most extraordinary, I might almost call it a communistic proceeding. I entirely fail to understand what is the justification for the whole of these proceedings. The Government have not been very fortunate in their dealings with the question of tithe. Seven years ago we fought them, and in two successive years they were obliged to drop the Tithes Bills which they had brought in. But we never before dreamt in this country of subverting the whole principle on which the tithe is paid. No doubt we made the landlord responsible, but we did not alter the quality of the tithe or the method by which it was valued, as was so humorously stated by my hon. friend behind me. This Bill rests upon the fact that the Government *Gazette* has not published the materials for estimating the tithe. Certainly, a more extravagant basis on which to rest a Bill I never heard. All I can say is that, for my part, I shall oppose this Bill in all its stages, because I believe it to be thoroughly unsound financially, and from the point of view of policy to be a very dangerous precedent. I cannot conceive why, at this moment, you should think it necessary, after all the grants you have made to the Irish landlords on one pretence or another, and simply on account of a defect in the publication in the *Dublin Gazette*, to bring forward a proposal which affects more than a million of money of a public fund which you have no right to deal with in the manner it is dealt with in this Bill.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): I do not understand the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman and the other Members opposite who oppose this Bill, which is intended to remove an injustice from which many men in Ireland have suffered. I myself and others will not benefit from it by a single penny, but I know that others suffer from a monstrous injustice. My complaint, and that of many from my part of the country, is that the Bill does not go far enough.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Why do you not take the whole Church Fund?

MR. ARCHDALE: The Church has been robbed, but I am glad to say that we are supporting it well. As regards this Tithe Bill, it does not, in my opinion, go half far enough; and I only wish that those who oppose it had to pay tithe when they have not money to pay it with. I understand that members of the Church are being served with writs to pay the tithe by the 1st of May, although they do not get the rents with which to pay it until November. It is said that this Bill uses public money for the benefit of one class; but I do not know how hon. Members can employ that contention when they must know that up to the year 1824 tithe was payable entirely on produce; but in the year 1838, owing to the number of outrages committed during the collection of the tithe, the occupier was entirely relieved from the burden, and the owner was made liable, and the tithe was collected in the shape of rent. In the year 1881, when the Land Act was passed, owing to the fall in prices, and foreign competition, the ownership of the land was taken from the landlords. In 1872, when the Irish Church was plundered, the ecclesiastical tithe was fixed by Act of Parliament to make the security for the nine millions coming out of the British Treasury. The value of the ecclesiastical tithe was fixed at 22½ years purchase, although at the same time the lay tithe was valued at eighteen years purchase. By that means the British Parliament plundered a million from the payers of lay tithe in Ireland. I think there could not be a more honest or just measure than this Bill, and I cannot understand how Members from Ireland, when they know that the Land Commission has reduced rents all over the country, when they know that the tenants do not pay tithe, which is a charge on land—the ownership having been taken from the landlord and given to the tenant—should refuse to see that the tithe charge should not be reduced in proportion to the reduction of rent. I was pleased to hear some hon. Members say that a great relief was given to the tenants by the Act of 1898, but I was sorry to hear the hon. Member for North Louth sneering at the new Agricultural Department, and alleging that it was established to make rents more payable in Ireland. I was also sorry to hear what he said about the churches. In my own neighbourhood three or four churches have been built by members of my own family, and I do not think we are taking them from anyone. When the hon. Member for East Mayo was talking of the landlord class robbing Ireland at the time of the Union, I know perfectly well that my great grandfather was one of the strongest opponents of the Union—he was just as strong against it as I am for it at the present time. I am sorry that family history does not turn out more Members of my opinion. If hon. Members would only look at things in an honest light, and recollect that these tithes have been fixed at a higher value than was right, they would not oppose the Bill. The hon. Member talks about the grease given to the Irish landlords. I do not know many landlords who have got much grease, but I do know that out of the money given to the Church Fund by members of my faith, more than £7,000,000 has been given to Ireland. The hon. Members opposite say the landlords have taken all the grease, but the grease, so far as I know, has gone the other way. The grease that came our way had no substance. When it had any substance it went the other way.

Mr. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I am sorry that the hon. Member for North Fermanagh is not in his place. The story he told to the House is the one that every landlord preaches when a Bill is brought forward for the purpose of giving something to the landlords. It does not go far enough—that was what was preached by the hon. Member, and I am sure he is little more than the spokesman of his class in this House. If the whole of the Church Fund were given to Irish landlords it would not satisfy them. The Irish landlords are constantly preaching their poverty, and asking doles and bribes from this House. I hope the House will reject the proposal brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland. I think his argument this evening is not consistent with the speech he made at Leeds a short time ago, wherein he stated that the salvation of the tenant farmers of Ireland was the land purchase scheme. It does not seem to me that the right hon. Gentleman was sincere in his remarks, because it does not look as if he was anxious to get rid of the landlords when he brings in a Bill to give them a part of the Irish Church Fund. The hon. Member for North Fermanagh mentioned that a million of money was given from the Church Fund to intermediate education, but he forgot to state that the children of his co-religionists received their share from this. A sum of £1,300,000 also goes to the school teachers of Ireland, and it must be remembered that the Protestant children in the National schools are educated with a portion of that money. Surely the hon. Member for North Fermanagh would not for a moment say that the landlord class should gobble the whole of this sum. If he does, I am sure the Members of this House would certainly not submit to any such proposal. That is the proposal the hon. Member brought forward here. I am opposed to the Second Reading of the Bill, when I consider the large claims that are already made on the Church Fund for the purposes of education—£1,000,000 for intermediate education, £1,300,000 for National school purposes, and other portions for the Presbyterian Church, Maynooth College, and the Congested Districts Board. In view of these claims at the present time, it would be a very dangerous thing to make any further inroads on the Church Fund. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary stated that in the case of this Church Fund running out there would be nothing easier than to approach the Treasury and get a grant of £30,000. My experience is that the Treasury is a very doubtful source for the Irish people to rely upon for anything they want. The Irish Members have been asking some trifling grants to help the distressed people in the West of Ireland, and I know the cold ear given to them by the Government when the proposal was made.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Mr. Flavin, Kerry, N.). House counted, and forty Members being found present, MR. DALY, continuing, said: The hon. Member for North Fermanagh spoke about the Church Fund being plundered. I think it is only a matter of justice that the hon. Member should support his own clergy. It is the greatest shame that in a country where the Catholic population is in the proportion of five to one Protestant, the Catholics have to support the Protestant Church and also their own clergy. I should also remark that in this so-called plunder of the Church Fund several millions were given to the church to which the hon. Member belongs. The landlords pay the tithes, but they raised rents enormously. I know one estate where 20 per cent. was put on the rents. Taking all these rises of rents into consideration, the Government come to this House proposing to give a dole of several thousand pounds to the landlords. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he had spoken to several people—I suppose they may have been Members of the House of Lords—in regard to the Bill which was passed fixing the tithe as a permanent charge, and they had informed him that it was not considered at all. I must differ from the right hon. Gentleman. I find that the price of oats in 1871 was 25s. 2d. per quarter, in 1873 it was 25s. 3d., and in 1874, 28s. 10d. The price was steadily rising, and to my mind the reason why the Bill was allowed to pass so quietly through the House of Lords was that the Lords thought the price would continue to rise. They took that for granted, and they thought they were making a real good bargain at the time. The moment they find that the bargain has not turned out as expected they come whining to this House to get a dole from the Church Fund. I agree with the hon. Member for East Mayo that the best thing the right hon. Gentleman could do would be to withdraw the Bill altogether. It is really a shame that the landlords should come to this House asking doles. When the poor people of the West of Ireland required relief there was no Bill brought in on their behalf. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will see his way not to persist in going on with this Bill, which is not agreeable to the vast majority of the poor people of Ireland. My constituents are very anxious that this Bill should not become law, and so far as I am concerned I will vote against the Second Reading.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): This is a Bill that deeply affects the Irish Members and the people whom they represent, but it also concerns Members representing constituencies in other parts of Great Britain as well, and on that ground I venture to address a very few observations to the House upon the measure. In the first place I am surprised, after the very pointed appeal that was made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth, who spoke on this matter with peculiar authority as an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is not present. I hope that we shall see him in his place at all events at a later stage in the debate, in order that we may hear from his own lips the defence he has to offer for this extraordinary Bill, which, I venture to say, violates some of the most elementary canons of financial justice. The right hon. Gentleman, I am afraid, has been the unwilling victim during the present Parliament of more than one raid upon the Treasury, which he by himself has been powerless to resist. I was under the impression that we had got to the very end of these doles to favoured classes which have signalised this Parliament above perhaps any other Parliament that has existed during the present century. We are, perhaps, in our unctuous rectitude, rather fond of pointing to the horrible misdeeds of Tammany Hall in America, and to the frightful corruption that existed in the Transvaal, but I venture to say that if Bills of this kind were passed by Tammany Hall, and by the Transvaal Government, we should be the first to denounce them for political corruption. The landlords of Ireland are having this dole given to them to the large amount of a million and a half sterling, if we capitalise the annual grant. Any landlord may at once sell his property if he chooses, and obtain practically the whole of the capital value. It is practically a gift of a lump sum of a million and a half to the landlords, who are to benefit under these provisions. The hon. Member for North Fermanagh complained of the treatment the landlords of Ireland had received at the hands of Parliament. Why, take a single case. Under the Bill relating to the rating of agricultural land in Ireland, one nobleman received an amount by that so-called Local Government Bill equivalent in cash to £60,000 or £70,000. There was an hon. Gentleman—I see he is not in his place now—sitting opposite me when that Bill was passed, who went into the Lobby and voted for £500 or £600, indeed I think it was £700 a year, to be put into his own pocket. He had a perfect right to do that, but as a matter of fact if the Chancellor of the Exchequer, from his place in Parliament, had stepped below the gangway and handed that hon. Gentleman £15,000 or £20,000, or whatever the capital value was, he could not have made a more direct gift from the Treasury than was made to that particular Irish landlord. That is the kind of legislation which from time to time we have seen in the course of this present Parliament. I thought for very shame we had seen the last of it, but here we have presented to us a Bill which proposes to take from the national funds a considerable sum of money and hand it over to a particular class—a class perhaps which is not as wealthy as it used to be in the past, but which at the same time is not a particularly poor, nor, I would add, a particularly deserving class. We were under the impression a short time ago that something was to be done for Ireland by the present Government. We were told that the golden moment had arrived in the sad and unhappy history that has for so long existed between that island and this country when we might expect something in the nature of a great measure of conciliation, and that expectation was given voice to not merely by those in Ireland who must have desired something of the kind, but by those who support the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the bill in this country. That expectation has been disappointed. Nothing of the kind has been done, but the very least I should have thought that Ireland could have expected from this Ministry at the present time would have been abstention from forcing through Parliament a Bill of this kind, the effect of which has been so well described by hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House. It has been felt that the empire owes a debt of gratitude to Ireland, but Ireland apparently is not only expected to shed her blood, but to shed her money. I hope that this is the last of these measures. I hope that the common sense of this country will prevail over the system of giving doles and sops and bribes to wealthy and privileged classes. I hope that they will cease. We have had enough of it during this Parliament to make any sober-minded man feel that our finance is in dangerous hands indeed. We are piling our debt up by tens of millions, and out of our national funds we have made these grants time and again. We are allowing our own industries in our own country to languish—industries that might be profitably developed—like, for instance, the afforesting of the country. All these things are neglected for political support, and political support only is thought of. I trust that before long we shall have a Ministry in power which will have the honesty to deal with questions of this kind, not from the point of view of what political support it can gain from certain classes of the community, but looking at the interest of the community as a whole, and, particularly in the case of a poor community like Ireland, remembering to act in the interest of the masses, and not of the classes, who benefit by such legislation as this.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): It is hardly to be expected that a member from the Principality should know very much about the Irish question or the peculiar law in Ireland relating to tithes, or the peculiar claims in Ireland upon the particular fund out of which it is proposed to remedy this grievance, and therefore I was not at all surprised at the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken. But I regret that the red herring of landlordism, which has been skilfully drawn across the trail, should have been introduced into this debate. If I thought for a moment that the passing of this Bill would take a single penny out of the pockets of the tenants of Ireland I should not be at liberty to follow the course I now take in supporting the measure. It shows the ignorance of the hon. Gentleman opposite that he should suppose that the Government would gain anything by administering a dole, as he calls it, to the landlords of Ireland in return for their political influence. Any hon. Member who knows anything about Ireland knows that in every constituency in the North of Ireland, the landlords, be it for good or be it for evil, have lost all political influence, and therefore, to put it on the lowest basis, it would not be worth the while of the Government to try to conciliate by a dole landlords who cannot, unaided by the democracy, return a single Member to this House. I have been returned as a neutral on these very acute questions between landlord and tenant, and I do not think any hon. Member can accuse me of having broken my election pledges in those matters. I have always declined to take any course in this House which could be described as anything but neutral in regard to these acute questions, and if any hon. Member will convince me that in supporting this Bill I should be taking one penny out of the pockets of the tenants I will at once walk out of the House.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: Are you putting anything into the landlords' pockets by it?

MR. WILLIAM MOORE: That is another matter. Wherever there is an Irish grievance, no matter which class may be suffering from it, I would like to see it remedied out of funds in the possession of the English Treasury. But the fact that the sufferers happen to be landlords, or Unionists, or Protestants is no reason why that grievance should not be redressed if we have an opportunity of doing it. What happens here? We all know the origin of tithes. The amount of the tithe was originally payable in kind, and nothing could more plainly show how dependent it was upon the value of the commodity. The tenant has had his rent reduced according to the price of the commodities, and if these people, who are called landlords—and if "landlord" means anyone whose great grandfather may have been a landlord, perhaps it is a good definition—are now paying an annual sum to a Government body, which exacts it to the day without mercy or scruple, which is in excess of the real value of the commodity on which it was originally based, it is the duty of honest men in this House to support this Bill if it will give those people relief. How has this matter arisen? If matters had gone on as the framers of these Acts at the beginning of Her Majesty's reign had intended, there would have been a variation, and that variation would have depended directly upon the price of the produce. The intention of the Legislature was that every seven years, according as prices went up or down, the tithe should be varied. How is it that that variation has not taken place? Simply because the proprietor or editor of the *Dublin Gazette* omitted to publish the statutory details which were required before a variation could take place.

SERJEANT HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): That applies only to lay tithes.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE: It would have been only right and fair that every injustice occasioned by the suppression of those facts from the *Dublin Gazette* should have been included in this remedial measure before us. The hon. Member for East Mayo read from a memorandum that perpetual rents should be varied also, but they could only be varied by an award based on these returns which should have appeared in the *Dublin Gazette*. Therefore while this Bill, being a Tithes Bill, provides only for enabling the tithepayer on a new basis to vary his tithe, there is no provision whatever for these perpetual rentpayers who pay to the same body, and whose rents should also vary with the price of corn, to have their rents revised. I say that if you are going to remedy this grievance of the tithe payers you ought also to remedy the grievance with regard to the rent, and confer upon the perpetual rent payers similar benefits to those contained in this Bill, but that is no reason why the grievance which is dealt with should not be redressed. It is proved that money was lent on certain terms at 4 per cent., and it is also proved that the instalments will repay capital and interest in forty-five years. If that is so, why should you spread the repayment over fifty-two years when the whole sum will have been paid in forty-five? That is not a matter of politics; it is a matter of common honesty. It is no argument against that that the people happen to be landlords. If I can find any Bill which will provide that where the Government, no matter how long ago, entered into a contract of this sort by which money was to be repaid, capital and interest, by instalments payable for a certain period, the Government will be prepared now, owing to the reduced price of money, to vary that contract, I shall be exceedingly glad. We ought really to welcome the principle of this Bill, instead of abusing it as being absolutely in opposition to all sound rules of finance. I think, on the whole, if this matter is considered impartially, it will be seen where the justice lies, and hon. Members will then be bound to support the Bill.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid) considered that the Bill was one which, if the Irish Members allowed it to pass without the strongest protest, would mark a sad step in the decay of the members of the Irish party. The measure should be divided against, and every form of the House used to prevent the success of this attack upon the only fund which the Irish nation now had in reserve. If the right hon. Gentleman desired to do his friends a favour, why did he not go to that inflated fund known as the Local Taxation Account? According to the experts of their own Government, the British nation owed Ireland millions of pounds, and if the Chief Secretary desired to bolster up a class he should go to a fund of his own country, and then the Irish would say nothing about it. To come at this time of day, and ask the Irish Members to vote without protest another burden upon the people of Ireland, was an outrage and a scandal. It seemed to be a favourite pastime to get the Irish people to fight one another, and when that could not be done to get them to rob one another, and now the landlords were to be allowed to rob the Irish Church Fund. This matter concerned the Irish people very seriously, and such a fraud would not be allowed to be perpetrated without decent publicity and protest. The Chief Secretary claimed that it was only an extension of a system already existing with regard to Irish tenants, but that statement was very wide of the mark. How were the Irish tenants treated by the landlords in days gone by? Was not every possible penny extorted from them? Were they not like drowning men who would clutch at any straw to save themselves from ruin? To place such men on a level with landlords with regard to tithe-rent charge was really asking the House to swallow a very large dose. The landlords had no claim on the people, and why should the tenants of Ireland be asked to contribute a grant of something like £1,500,000? The right hon. Gentleman had said there would be a loss to the Irish people with regard to one clause of £33,000 a year, and that that would go on increasing. That was a very serious matter, and the people did not intend to allow that money to be taken without receiving some corresponding benefit. The hon. Member was proceeding to argue that since the passing of the Local Government Act rates had been increased all over the country through the action of the Local Government Board, when——

*MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Gentleman that the action of the Local Government Board was not under discussion.

MR. MURNAGHAN said he was trying to point out that recent legislation had resulted in a very heavy charge on the ratepayers, and as the present Bill dealt financially with the country he thought it might have some bearing on that point. He would not, however, labour the point. The whole history of landlordism was one of the darkest pages in the history of Ireland. Thousands of people had been driven from her shores, and now the Chief Secretary wished to rehabilitate himself with this class at the expense of the Irish nation; but as long as they possibly could the Nationalist representatives would prevent him doing so. They admitted the lay impropriator had a grievance which ought to be remedied, but on to the real grievance were hitched provisions which would benefit a class that had no grievance whatever. He therefore strongly protested against this Bill, and hoped it would be rejected.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): We have had two speeches to-night, that of the hon. Member for East Mayo and that of the hon. Member for North Louth, in which apparently a common assault was made upon this Bill and the principle upon which it is founded. Both of those hon. Members agreed that ever since legislation had been passed in regard to tithe rent in Ireland unnumbered benefits and a vast amount of gold had been showered on the Irish landlords. But neither of those gentlemen attempted to prove their statements. I venture to make the assertion—and I should like any hon. Gentleman opposite who follows me to deal with it—that from the year 1823 down to the year 1872 the Irish landlords reaped no benefit whatever from legislation in regard to this matter. My assertion is based simply on the way in which I read the statutes and the effect they have had on the class to which I have the fortune or the misfortune to belong. The Bill of 1823 made the composition of tithe rent optional. Apparently that was not found to act well in

Ireland, and so we had the Bill of 1832, which made it obligatory that the composition should be paid, and that the landlord should recover the tithe from the tenant, the landlord thereby undertaking what might be looked upon as a difficult operation. Hon. Members opposite are probably aware that in recent times the Land Commission has issued monthly Returns in regard to the rents in Ireland, and it has been shown by that body—who are not supposed to be extremely favourable to Irish landlords—["Oh, oh!"]—of course, that is a matter of opinion—it has been shown that in the majority of cases of Irish rents the rent has not been raised within living memory, and that no difference has been made owing to the fact that the tithe rent-charge had to be levied on the tenant. The Irish landlord in recent times has had quite enough difficulty to get his ordinary rent paid, and it would not be wise for him to alter his rental for the very small sums which these tithes usually represent. In the majority of cases, sooner than do that the landlord has paid the charge himself. Under the Bill of 1873 demesne lands were included in the payment for tithe, and it could hardly be said that that was a gain to the landlords. But the Bill of 1838 has been taken as a Bill under which great gain accrued to the landlords, 25 per cent. being taken off the composition. But the hon. Member for East Mayo forgot that the difference of 25 per cent. did not go to the landlord, because the Act only enabled him to add the rent charge, and not the composition, to the tenant's rent.

Mr. DILLON: Mr. Disraeli said that £100,000 went to the Irish landlords.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: Mr. Disraeli was not the only Minister who knew nothing about Ireland. At any rate the hon. Member for East Mayo cannot deny that this 25 per cent. reduction absolutely did not go into the pockets of the landlords at all. The hon. Member for North Louth drew a picture of the Irish landlord which I only wish was true. According to him we are so full of money that if this Bill were passed we could go, of all places in the world, to Monte Carlo. I can only say that I do not think the difference it would cause to my income would enable me to go even to Dublin and back. It appears to me that these gentlemen have made one mistake. They attack this Bill mainly because it proposes to reduce the period of redemptions from fifty-two to forty-five years. That, to the right hon. Gentleman for West Monmouth, is a monstrous thing. What would be said if this House, supposing it had the power, proposed to make any subject of the Queen pay a debt he did not owe? I can conjure up in my own mind the sort of speeches we should have in this House from the hon. Member for East Mayo, and the hon. and learned Member for North Louth, if it was proposed that an Irish tenant, after he had paid the instalments for his farm, was asked to go on paying those instalments for seven years more when he had already paid the debt. That is just what this Bill proposes to prevent. It proposes that the Irish landlords should not be asked to pay a debt which after forty-five years they do not owe at all. Is that a monstrous gift to the Irish landlords? The Chief Secretary for Ireland stated the case very plainly on the 13th April, 1896,* when he said—

> "There is no doubt whatever that the landlords have been very harshly dealt with in this matter. When the landlords redeem the tithe rent-charge, what is supposed to be redeemed is the net tithe rent-charge, exclusive of the poor rate. As a matter of fact, the annuity which they now have to pay—namely, £4 9s. for fifty-two years—would, on the supposition that the interest is calculated at the rate of £3 10s. per cent., pay off not the net but the gross tithe rent-charge."

This Bill simply does what any honest man and honourable House of Commons would do—that is, it provides that the Irish landlords should not be asked to pay a debt they have already settled. It is absurd to say that that is a gift of seven years instalments to the landlords; it is simply an act of common honesty on the part of the House of Commons. I do not look upon it as a favour or a dole, but as something which the landlords have a right to demand. I do not know whether any hon. Members opposite will deal with this point, but I do not see how they can prove that even the landlords, whom they detest so much, and whom they would like to expatriate and grind under foot should be the only men in the world to be asked to pay a debt which they do not owe. Then comes the question of the system upon which you are to estimate the tithe rent-charge. As to the system on which tithe rent-charge was estimated, it is well known that before 1872 it was estimated on the price of wheat and oats. The Bill of 1872 swept that revision away. Undoubtedly that was an act of great injustice, for it took away from the landowning class that revision which all the tenants of Ireland possess. The revision on the price of wheat and oats had been swept away, but the Government have substituted for that revision the revision which takes place in rent, and the hon. and learned Member for North Louth calls that a monstrosity. The hon. Member stands up for high political principles, and he views with great suspicion anything that will throw the slightest shade or shadow of doubt upon those principles of statesmanship which have guided the country to which he does not wish to belong. You have now swept away those two articles wheat and oats, which I believe are used in this country; you have swept them away as a method of revision, and you have substituted by this Act an easy and a fair method of revising the tithe rent-charge. I would remind the House that the Irish landlords, whatever their faults may be—and I hope they are not guilty of all the things ascribed to them by hon. Gentlemen opposite—have been treated by this country in a way in which no other landlords in the world have been treated by a legislature. [Cries of "No, no."] I defy any hon. Member to point to any civilised country in the world where, by the arbitrary act of the legislature, a quarter of the landlords' income has been swept away. This House of Commons having decided that it was necessary for State purposes that the Irish landlords should be thus treated, I say that we have a right to ask in this House that they shall be treated fairly even in this small question of the tithe rent-charge. It is only a very small question, although hon. Gentlemen opposite appear very timid as to the effect this legislation will have upon the Church Fund. Surely anybody who reads the figures will see that there is no danger in the direction indicated. That fund amounts to £597,000, which will be diminished in the year 1901 to £250,000, so that there is no real ground for the fear entertained. I look upon this Bill as one which will give a certain amount of fair play to the Irish landlords, who have been treated by you as no other class in any other country has ever been treated. The landlords of Ireland have been dealt with as a sort of political commodity, and they have been badgered about to suit the political exigencies of the moment. By a sweeping Act of Parliament they have been deprived of a quarter of their income. This has been done by the State for State reasons, but I do not desire to go back on that legislation. That fact stands staring us in the face, and the Irish landlord has never received a shilling for undergoing this painful operation. This Bill is intended to a very microscopic extent to extend a certain measure of justice to Irish landlords, and I hope the House of Commons will not be led astray by the interesting and amusing speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite, or by the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth. This Bill aims at doing justice to the landlords, and it is founded upon justice and fair play. I hope, therefore, that it will be read a second time by the British House of Commons.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. xxxix., p. 814.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: The hon. and gallant Member who has just sat down has described this Bill as an act of common honesty. My comment upon that is that it is very easy to be honest at the expense of other people. We have not observed that fine sense of honesty which the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite congratulates the Government upon in their dealings with the much more ample resources at the disposal of the British Treasury. The hon. Member for North Antrim alluded to the loans issued in Ireland, and I think when the Chief Secretary heard him make that allusion he must have thought it singularly unfortunate. What are the facts about these loan borrowers? A year ago deputations from all parts of Ireland representing the clergy of all denominations, including Catholic priests, Presbyterians, and members of the Church in Ireland, brought before the Chief Secretary the case of the tithe-owners, so far as it relates to the revenues and the charges with which the Chief Secretary was then dealing, not in connection with an Irish Parliament, but with the British Treasury; but on that occasion the right hon. Gentleman found himself unable to administer that honesty upon which the hon. and gallant Gentleman has congratulated him to-night. That is exactly a parallel case. It is said in the case of these tithe rents that they were originally calculated on a basis which was unjust to the Irish tithe-payer. All I know is that the Act of Parliament prescribed the terms on which these tithe-payers could redeem those tithes if they liked, and it was not compulsory upon them to come in and redeem. No tithe-payer in Ireland has taken advantage of the supposed benefits which the Church Act conferred upon them. It was a purely voluntary process created, as it was supposed, specially for the benefit of the Irish tithe-owner. They came in not upon any declaration made in the House of Commons with regard to the rate of interest, but to redeem their tithes on a basis fixed by Act of Parliament, which it was open to them either to accept or reject. It is under these circumstances that we are told to-night that because those terms were unfair and dishonest to the Irish landlords Parliament is now bound to perform an act of restitution. The loan borrowers made out an exactly similar case, and they pointed out that the rate of interest was unfair; but the interest was not reduced, although the rate which was fixed enabled the Treasury to make a large profit. The reply of the Treasury was that Parliament had fixed the rate of interest for the loans, and they would have to pay every penny. It is notorious that a very large number of local bodies who have borrowed money from the Treasury at the fixed rate of interest have applied to pay off the principal and interest of the loan because the interest was too high, and because they could borrow money much more cheaply. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer replies, "No, you contracted to pay this loan off in a particular manner, you contracted to pay it off by instalments payable over a certain number of years, and we should make a loss if we allowed you to redeem the loan at par." And consequently the Chancellor of the Exchequer bound these Irish local bodies strictly to the terms upon which they have borrowed. Where is the distinction between these borrowers and the case of the Irish landlords? The Irish local bodies have not a penny interest in the transaction, for they are simply public representatives defending public interests, such as boards of guardians and town commissioners. This is the measure of justice which is meted out to this class of borrowers, while special terms are made for the Irish landlords. What is the distinction between the two cases? There is only one distinction—in the case of the Irish landlords you are dealing with an Irish fund, but in the case of the borrowers you are dealing with the funds of the British Treasury, and therefore they will exact the last farthing. I want to ask the Chief Secretary a question about another case which has arisen. He has told us that these tithe annuities will not expire till 1917. I draw his attention to the fact that some expire five years hence, and my knowledge of the fact is derived from the circumstance that I had some professional concern with a case which is at present before the Irish Courts, in which a gentleman who had sold his land was ordered by Judge Ross to pay. The position of that case is that if the proceedings had commenced two months ago or lasted a couple of months longer that gentleman would have been forgiven every penny of this loan. Will the right hon. Gentleman make restitution in that case? Will he hand it back?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Was that under the Land Acts?

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Yes.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: That makes all the difference.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon, I misunderstood his question. It was in the Landed Estates Court—but it was a case of ordinary land sale, and the gentleman has been ordered to redeem the land-charge. He has been ordered to pay this five years rent-charge, which it is simply extortion to take. The right hon. Gentleman is involving himself in no little difficulty by this piece of legislation. The Bill deals with two different subjects—it deals with the lay tithe and the Ecclesiastical tithe, and as regards both its parts the Bill works the gravest injustice, in the one case to the tithe-owner and in the other to the tithe-payer. It does not go far enough in the case of the lay tithe and it goes too far in the case of the Ecclesiastical tithe. The right hon. Gentleman does not see the extraordinary consequences to which it leads. What are the facts as to the lay tithe? Hitherto it has been adjustable every five or ten years on the basis of the price, in some cases of wheat and in the other of oats which are grown in the district. It has happened in the case of wheat that wheat growing has largely disappeared in Ireland, and the right hon. Gentleman thinks that that is a sufficient justification for abolishing the price of wheat as a basis in all transactions. But what is his justification for a tithe fixed upon a basis of the price of oats? Does he know what the facts are in the county of Monaghan, where oats as a crop are largely grown? In that county, as in every other part of Ireland where oats are grown, the tithe-owners find themselves in this position, that if the right hon. Gentleman had left the law as it was, they would not have found their tithes reduced more than 15 per cent.; under this Bill they are reduced 20, 30, or 35 per cent. How can the right hon. Gentleman defend that? I am amazed that hon. Gentlemen opposite who represent Irish constituencies should listen to a proposition of that kind in this House. I am an owner of tithes of twenty generations; I hold them with a right to have them adjusted upon a certain basis; that basis will reduce my tithe 15 per cent., and the right hon. Gentleman brings in a Bill by which my property will suddenly be reduced, not by 15 per cent., but by a percentage varying from 20 to 35 per cent. How can hon. Gentlemen having an interest in property in Ireland, either land or tithes, defend such a proposition? Because the result upon the whole will be to give them a certain amount of money out of the public purse. That is why they come and justify this proposal. If that had not been the result they would have been the first to denounce it as spoliation and confiscation. There has been a wrong and an injustice done as regards both the tithe owners and the tithe payers. The fault has been committed by a public official. We do not know whose the fault was. Reference has been made to the editor of the *Dublin Gazette*, but I have been told that it was the fault of the Irish Land Commission.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: It was not the fault of the Irish Land Commission.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: But whosoever it was, owing to the blunder of some official, a wrong has been done to the owners of the lay tithe. Why not redress that wrong in a plain and obvious way by remedying the blunder? But no, the right hon. Gentleman, instead of remedying the blunder, makes an assault in the one case on the tithe-owners and in the other case upon the tithe-payer. I have shown that in the case of oats it is an assault on the tithe-owner, and in the case of wheat it is an assault upon the tithe-payer. I ask again what is the right hon. Gentleman's justification for making the landlord, who happens to be the tithe-payer, pay tithes at the rate of 15 per cent., when, if he had the law, his tithes would be reduced 50 per cent? Erskine once said that he had held many briefs, and though he sometimes had won cases which he ought to have lost, and sometimes lost cases which he ought to have won, on the average justice was done. That is the practice of the right hon. Gentleman in this case; so far as the lay tithe-payer is concerned this Bill is indefensible and unjust. What should have been done should have been to remedy the wrong which has been committed, and if the right hon. Gentleman was desirous of changing his procedure and wished to do that, we should be glad to assist him, even if his proposals went to the extent of entire revision; but to wholly revolutionise the procedure and the law, utterly disregarding the appeals of all parties in this manner, appears to me to be wholly undesirable. Another question is, what is the right hon. Gentleman going to do with the tithes lessees? In many cases these tithes are let out, and the man who collects the tithes is a lessee paying a rent. The right hon. Gentleman proposes that the tithes of these gentlemen shall be cut down, sometimes more and sometimes less, but he proposes to make no alteration which they have to pay. But why, if the amount of the tithe for which he pays varies, should not the amount which he pays for the tithe vary also? That is another difference which the right hon. Gentleman has got himself into by this revolutionary procedure. Let me point out the last result of the extraordinary method adopted by the right hon. Gentleman. Take the case of the middleman, who pays a rent, and whose interest will cease in fifty or sixty years. His rents are cut down and he pays no tithes, his landlord pays the tithes and his rents are not cut down, and the right hon. Gentleman proposes that the landlord whose rents are not affected must have his tithes reduced because another man's rent has been cut down. The right hon. Gentleman cannot have considered the full scope of this Bill, and I think he will find when it emerges from the Committee stage he has involved himself in most extraordinary difficulties. I compliment him on the way in which he has mastered this subject, and the admirably clear and lucid statement in which he dealt with it, but I am sorry that the great intellect which he brought to bear upon the subject has not been more profitably engaged. Coming to the case of the ecclesiastical tithes, I ask what is the justification for the variation of ecclesiastical tithes. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh said that when the Bill of 1872 was passed nobody knew what had been done, and the suggestion was made that the tithe owners of Ireland were so negligent of their interests and so careless of their rights that they did not know what Mr. Gladstone was doing when he introduced that Act; but those gentlemen assented to that legislation because they thought that they were making a good bargain for themselves. 1872 was the prosperous year for Irish landlords; prices were rising, and rose to 1876, and the general idea at that time was that we should never see the end of Irish prosperity. The tithe-payers considered that under those circumstances, with increasing prices there would be an increase in the tithes. This right of adjustment was not an unused right, and accordingly there was a bargain by which each party thought he had got his way. Mr. Gladstone made his tithes proposal because large sums were being borrowed from the fund, and he wanted to make it secure. The classes which paid the tithes were all represented in this House at the time, and we on these benches cannot conceive that they would have let this Bill pass through this House almost *sub silentio* unless they thought they had a good bargain for themselves. From the time the Tithes Adjustment Act was passed right down to 1870 there were only sixty cases of adjustment all through Ireland, and when that right of adjustment was proposed to be taken away the Irish landlord thought it would not be used, and had not been used in the past, and that if it were used it would be used to his detriment, and he gave it up. It has turned out to be a bad bargain, but I have yet to learn that when a man has made a bad bargain he has a right to come to this House and ask it to get him out of it. I have witnessed in this House several English Tithes Bills passed. I understand in some towns in England this tithe tax is a most pressing burden, but my recollection of all those Bills passed for England is that they were Bills not to cut down the tithes and give the tithe-payer an easier term, but to facilitate the collection of tithes; but in Ireland, forsooth, when the tithe-owner raises a cry you immediately come to his rescue, and we hear again from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh the old story of reduction and relief. Does anybody believe that these reductions are due to the Irish Land Courts? Were there no reductions of rent in England? I have always understood that the reduction of rents in England, where there are no Land Courts, was quite as great, if not greater, than was the case in Ireland. The landlords of Ireland only did under compulsion of the law what the English landowners did of their own free will. No doubt the Land Courts brought it about earlier than would have been the case. The Irish tenant would have had to wait and agitate for what the English landowner did on his own initiative as a measure of justice; but the rents would have fallen anyhow, and it is false to say that the Land Courts reduced them, and that therefore the State should now step in to lower the tithes by similar means. The burden of tithes is an obstacle in the process of land purchase, and I believe if in this Bill the right hon. Gentleman had made the purchase of land more easy he would have met with very little opposition. Instead of giving the Irish landlord who sells his property upon equitable terms a sort of bonus by dealing equitably with the question of tithes, and saying we are willing to part with this fund to ease the wheels of land purchase, he has brought in this Bill and sacrificed the whole of the fund to the Irish landlord. He says it will not make the fund insolvent, and that he has not taken a penny too much of it. His case now is that the fund is just sufficient for the purposes of this Bill, but that means that there is a substantial sum in hand for the Irish people, and that money the right hon. Gentleman is throwing away for no useful purpose. I regret that the right hon. Gentleman has not used his great ability to put progress into this Bill, and that he has not dealt with this question of tithes in a statesmanlike manner. I protest against this measure.

*MR. LECKY (Dublin University) confessed that he was rather inclined to agree with his right hon. and gallant friend the Member for North Armagh that this measure was not a very big one. Before 1838 tithes were paid by the occupier, and if the tithe rent-charge had continued to be paid by the occupier to the present day there would have been a very different disposition on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite. However, Irish landlords at that time consented to take over the tithe for a great public purpose, for the support of their Church, and for the pacification of the country, and it was universally said at that time that this was a mere transfer of collection, and that they would be able to recoup themselves out of the rent. I do not believe they generally did so. Many believed it was equitable that the Protestant landlord should pay for his own Church. In many cases the readjustment of innumerable small rents would have been very difficult. Sub-letting after 1838 was very common, which proved that competitive rents were not exacted by the owners of the soil, and it appeared in evidence before the Land Commission that, in hundreds or thousands of cases, Irish rents had been entirely unchanged since the period of the Tithe Commutation in 1838. What had happened since then? The Church was disestablished and disendowed, but the tithe was still to be revalued every seven years, according to the Tithe Commutation Act. That right of varying according to the price of corn, which was recognised by the Act of 1869, was taken away in 1872, principally, I believe, in order to give greater security to a loan of nine millions made by the Treasury on the security of the Church estates. At the time the change was made the price of wheat was about 45 per cent. and oats 22 per cent. higher than it was now, yet the Irish tithe rent-charger has still to pay according to the old price. The value of land was also then much higher than now. Then came the land legislation, which took away all power over his rental from the landlord. The hon. Member opposite said that there would have been a fall in rents if the agitation had never taken place. He admitted that the fall was partly due to economic considerations, but it was also due to political agitation. How far it was from corresponding with the market price of land was shown by the fact that in proportion as rent had fallen, tenant right had risen. All contracts were broken; the landlord had no longer any power over the rental of his estate, and the leases which would have enabled him, when they fell in after a certain time, to make new arrangements were mere waste paper. If anyone were to take the trouble to read the Report and the evidences of the Fry Commission he would see how arbitrary and how capricious in a large number of cases this land legislation had proved. At any rate, the landlord could not make his own arrangement about rent, although the tithe was essentially a charge on rent. Then there was the fall in prices of agricultural produce. Let the House bear in mind that the Irish landlord was the only tithe-payer who paid invariable tithes, as he was the only landlord who had no control over his rental. The tithe-payers in England had their tithes varied according to the corn measure, and accordingly they paid between 30 and 40 per cent. less than they did in 1872. Again, the redemption of the tithes was fixed by the Act of 1869 at 22½ years purchase, while the market value was little, if at all, above 17 years purchase. The object of the Bill was simply to rectify all this and to make the tithe rent-charge variable, not, indeed, according to the corn estimates, but according to the average of the judicial rents in the county. There was another class of ecclesiastical tithe-owners in Ireland—those who had commuted their tithes for a fixed payment extending over fifty-two years. This period was reduced from fifty-two to forty-five years. This, as the Chief Secretary had shown, was a mere rectification of "a manifest injustice," and in the case of land purchased under the Land Act of 1896, it had already been carried into effect. The fifty-two period bought not the net but the gross tithe rent-charge, and it was a mere matter of arithmetic that payments extending over forty-five years fully paid the landlord's debt. This portion of the Bill was a boon, but it gave no present relief to the commuted tithe rent-charger. It would have been much more popular if the Government had kept up the longer period of payment and reduced the amount of instalment. It would also have been fair if it had been arranged that all tithes must be redeemed at twenty years purchase, and that the Government might lend money to the landlords to redeem the tithes at the same rate as they had to tenants to purchase their holdings. Such a measure would have been a real boon to the greatly injured class. It would probably have tended to accelerate the sale of land to tenants, which was a great object of policy, and he did not think that any human being would have been one penny the worse. The lay tithes were never turned into invariable tithes, but continued, like the Ecclesiastical tithes before the Act of 1872, to vary every seven years according to the price of corn. The lay tithe-payers had a statutory right to this variation, and considering the great fall in the value of corn it was a very valuable right. By a pure blunder, due entirely to the Government and in no degree the fault of the tithe-payer, that right had been taken away. The variation was based on the price of corn given in the *Dublin Gazette.* Since 1879, Parliament had repealed a number of Acts which it was believed were quite obsolete, and among others, one obliging the *Dublin Gazette* to publish averages. Since 1887 the *Dublin Gazette* had published none, and the Courts had decided that no reduction could be given to lay tithe-owners, as, although they had a clear statutory right to it, the machinery for such reduction had been taken away; and they were therefore held responsible for the old rate of tithe. Many were paying 60 per cent. more than the Act of 1838 intended they should pay. He could not understand why the Government had not brought into the Bill the Church Perpetuity Rents. These were based upon fee farm grants made by the Government to Church tenants in 1872. To get these grants the tenants had to pay heavy fines and submit to an increase of rent. The covenants of their leases reserved a certain rent to the Government based on the price of corn, and with a right to revision every seven years according to the price. By the same blunder that deprived the lay tithe rent-chargers of the right of revision, that of the perpetual rent payers had been taken away. He accepted the Bill with gratitude as an act of justice and a fulfilment of an old pledge. No less than twelve years ago, when the present Lord Lieutenant was in another office, he acknowledged the reality of the grievance. The subject had been brought forward again and again in the Queen's Speech, and he thought it was quite time that the grievance should be redressed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): This Bill has been attributed by hon. Members opposite to various causes, among them being the abuse which has been so freely poured upon my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary—— [Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: By the *Daily Express.*] Yes, the abuse of that peculiarly envenomed organ, and of others. It has also been suggested that the Bill was brought in to conciliate the political support of the Irish landlords, but I can assure the House that no such motive has at all actuated my right hon. friend. This Bill, which is merely a repetition of the Bill introduced last year, is a kind of accompaniment to the Agricultural Bill, and was introduced because it was conceived to be a just one. It is a part of the policy of my right hon. friend to do justice to all creeds and classes and parties in Ireland; although experience has proved that such a policy is no more likely to escape abuse from those whom it is designed to serve than to excite the gratitude of those whom it does serve. The hon. Member for East Mayo said that he objects to the Bill for four reasons. He said it was a dole to the Irish landlords. Further, he was almost painfully sensitive of any attack upon property. He next referred to the agrarian legislation of the Grattan Parliament; and finally he objected to the Bill on account of its financial results.

MR. DILLON: My objection is that we cannot ascertain from the Government what the financial results will be.

MR. ATKINSON: Well, the uncertainty of the financial results. The Government differ from each and every one of these contentions; and I propose to deal with them in their order. The hon. Member said that the Bill is a dole and a bribe to the Irish landlords, who had no grievance at all. We submit that they have a grievance, and, unlike hon. Members opposite, we think that that grievance should be redressed, although they are landlords. I am quite aware that some of our Irish friends are accustomed to speak on this matter as if the idea of doing justice to a landlord is as absurd as doing justice to Beelzebub. We think that the landlords have a grievance, and that it ought to be redressed; and we will not be deterred from that by the parrot-like repetition of the phrase "doles to the Irish landlords." They have a grievance, first as regards the composition that they pay for tithes. If anyone had come into the House when hon. Gentlemen opposite were speaking who was unacquainted with the question of tithes, he might have supposed that there was some inherent difference between ecclesiastical and lay tithes, and that whereas lay tithes were always subject to revision, ecclesiastical tithes never were. Indeed, the hon. Member for Cork was eloquent on the iniquity of taking away from the tithe-owner the sacred rights of revision conceded by the Act of 1838. What does the hon. Member say to the Act of 1872, which took away all the rights of revision? And in order to justify that iniquity he invents a bargain. There was no bargain, not a trace of it, in Mr. Gladstone's Bill. Now, what was the position of the landlords after the Church Act was passed? I do not go back on the composition of the tithe rent-charge at 75 per cent. of the rent. I do not know whether that was a benefit or not. The witnesses on that point before the Devon Commission were almost equally divided. The Church Act of 1869 and the Act of 1872, making tithes, for the first time in the history of the world, not subject to revision, had nothing to say to each other. After the Church Act of 1869 was passed the person who paid tithe and he to whom it was paid were entitled to have the tithe rent-charge revised at a stated period on the basis laid down in the Act of 1838; but it was obviously Mr. Gladstone's desire that the tithe rent-charge should be redeemed, and he offered certain terms on which to redeem them. Here are his words—

> "If there be here any hon. Gentleman possessed of land in Ireland—and there are many—they will not be very grateful to me for what I am going to state. It is that we shall give to them unconditionally the tithe rent-charge at twenty-two and a half years purchase. That is, of course, twenty-two and a half years purchase, not of the old gross £100, but of the £75 a year. We make that offer because we think there may be landlords in Ireland who will be disposed at once to wind up the arrangement with us. But if gentlemen will listen to me they will see that we have another alternative for those who may not be disposed to purchase the tithe rent-charge out-and-out in money down at twenty-two and a half years purchase. It is this: We make to them a compulsory sale. I have not the least idea that anyone will object to that. We convey the tithe rent-charge to them under the following conditions:—We charge them in our books with £2,250 for every net £100 a year of tithe rent-charge. That is to say, we sell them a tithe rent-charge at a rate to yield them 4½ per cent. We then credit them on the other side with a loan of equal amount. We provide that we should pay off that loan by an annual instalment, with interest. But the rate of interest to be charged on the instalment is 3½ per cent. The consequence of that is that a fund of 1 per cent. will remain as a sinking fund to absorb the principal. The purchaser of the tithe rent-charge in that form—except that he will get rid of the fluctuation, for we must give him a fixed amount—will not be called upon to make any addition whatever to his annual payment. He will be liable to that annual payment for a term of forty-five years, and at the close of that term he will, under this arrangement, have the rent-charge, whatever it may be, for the residue of the time for nothing. That will be the financial effect of the arrangement, which I think will not be bad for the Irish landlord. I perceive by the buzz around me that this portion of the subject, at any rate, is not without some interest to a great many hon. Members."

And Mr. Gladstone went on to say that—

> "While in this manner we shall give twenty-two and a half years purchase and the tithe rent-charge of Ireland, the average rate at which that charge sells in the market is very little, if at all, more than sixteen or seventeen years purchase. On the other hand, it is not a bad arrangement for the public, because it may be safely taken as a general rule that the public, in arrangements reaching over a long period of time, are perfectly safe in undertaking to lend at 3½ per cent.*

Now, on turning to the clause in the Bill as introduced, I find that it provides for the payment of £4 10s. per cent. for only forty-five years—carrying out to the letter Mr. Gladstone's undertaking. But by some extraordinary change the clause in the Act reads, not forty-five years, but fifty-two years, the £4 10s. being reduced by a shilling only. It is arithmetically clear that at £3 10s. and £1 to the sinking fund the whole would be wiped off in forty-five years; but upon what principle was the landlord to be obliged to pay for every £100 he borrowed £4 9s. for seven years more than that? For every £100 he was obliged to pay £30 more than he had borrowed or bargained for. Is not that a grievance? Is it not just and right and equitable to relieve him from that payment? We ask these figures to be tested, and let the speech of Mr. Gladstone be compared with the Act, and the mistake will be seen. I do not believe that it was done intentionally. It was evidently a mistake.

---

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Third Series], Vol. cxciv., p. 45.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Did any Irish landlord ever complain of this mistake?

MR. ATKINSON: The truth of the matter is that the Irish landlords have many good qualities, and a good many vices; but I cannot believe that they desire to pay an annuity for seven years more than they need. It is impossible that the landlords should ever have assented to that. It is impossible that, having the matter put to them, they would have agreed to pay during the extra term for the debt which would be extinguished in forty-five years. On this point I submit that the landlords have a grievance which it is only just and right should be redressed. We are not going at all to disturb the terms, but we are anxious to correct a mistake which was a mutual mistake, and which would be almost redressed in a court of equity.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What about the Statute of Limitations?

MR. ATKINSON: There can be no justification, because of an obvious miscalculation, in requiring the landlords to pay more than they are entitled to pay. What is the next grievance? The hon. Member for East Mayo dwelt upon the great boon confered on the landlords by allowing them to redeem at twenty-two and a half years purchase. That is a matter on which I know difference of opinion exists, and I will not attempt to decide which view is right, but I will quote an authority which I know the hon. Member will respect, who has laid it down that the landlords were considerably mulcted by the operation of that provision. Mr. Murrough O'Brien, in his evidence before the Financial Relations Commission, said:

> "Before the Church Act the tithe rent-charge was not saleable in the market for more then seventeen years purchase. Since the time of the Church Act very few have been sold in the market, and the price fixed by the Church Act was twenty-two and a half years on the rent-charge, and twenty-five years on the perpetuity rents."

Then he was asked, "What, in your opinion, was the excess value adopted?" and he answered that the excess value was about two and three-quarters or three millions. If Mr. Murrough O'Brien is an authority when he lays down anything against the landlords, I presume he is an equal authority when he lays down anything in their favour; and unless the selling of this rent-charge at three millions too much can be considered an advantage, the landlords did not get any advantage under that scheme. What is the next point? We say the landlords have a grievance, because the right of revision, which the hon. Member for Cork regards as a sacred and valuable right, was taken away from them. It is said that that was done because prices were going up so fast. The hon. Member for East Donegal dissents.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I wish to repudiate all connection with the matter.

MR. ATKINSON: Oh, I meant the hon. Member for South Donegal. In 1867 wheat was £1 15s. 8d. per twenty stone, and oats was 16s. 3d. per barrel. In 1869 wheat had fallen 6s. and oats 1s. 3d., and from 1869 to 1872 there was a rise of 2s. 3d. on wheat and 2d. on oats. This is supposed to be the inducement which made the landlords not oppose the Bill of 1872.

MR. DILLON: Why did they not oppose it?

MR. ATKINSON: I do not know. It is not for me to say why they did not oppose it, but rather for the hon. Member to prove that there was a bargain between the Government and the landlords.

MR. DILLON: My proof consists in this, that when a large body of landlords in this House and in the House of Lords accepted the Bill without one word of objection, I take it that there must have been a bargain.

MR. ATKINSON: That would not have occurred to me. There is no foundation for saying that there was any rise in prices. Since 1867 there had been a steady fall, and between 1860 and 1872, when the Act was passed, prices were practically stationary, so that the landlord got no advantage. On the contrary, he lost this valuable right of revision. We therefore propose to restore that right. It is said by hon. Gentlemen opposite that we propose to restore it because rents have gone down. We have restored it for no such reason. We have restored it because the right of revision is inherent in the character and quality of tithe.

Mr. DILLON: The reason why we stated that the tithe was to be lowered because the rent had been lowered was because the Chief Secretary gave that as a reason when he introduced the Bill.

Mr. ATKINSON: The right hon. Gentleman gave this reason. In selecting the variation of rent as the basis of the new system of revision he stated that as tithe was paid with rent, therefore, when rent was reduced tithe ought to be reduced also. We submit it is just and fair that the right of revision should be restored to the landlords. What system shall be given? Shall we restore the old system or establish a new system? What was the old system? It was the most costly, cumbersome, expensive, illogical and ridiculous system that could be invented, because tithes are payable not from wheat and oats alone, but from all agricultural products generally. The selection of wheat and oats as the basis of the tithe rent was merely an accident, and the accident was that there was no record of prices for any other species of agricultural produce. Under Acts passed in the reign of George III. there was an elaborate system of ascertaining the price of wheat and oats in Dublin and the country, and that system being in existence was borrowed as a basis for tithe rent, but it really had no inherent relation to the capacity or productiveness of the soil. With regard to nine-tenths of Ireland it would be just as reasonable to revise tithes on the price of diamonds as on the price of wheat.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Thanks to England.

Mr. ATKINSON: Therefore, when we had to revise tithe we said it was more rational and more reasonable to adopt a new system. The hon. Member for East Mayo said that it is not only fallacious, but almost wicked to say that tithes are charged on the rent. Tithes are not charged on the rent, but they are paid out of the rent, and are a charge on the products of the land. The best proof of that is that an owner of tithes can get a receiver appointed who will take the rent until the tithes are satisfied. The hon. Member for East Mayo said that he was opposed to us taking a public fund and applying it for the benefit of a particular class, but in that argument he spoke as if this were not a charge variable by its very nature. I pass now to the financial result. My right hon. friend has explained that first of all this fund is solvent and that it can meet all the charges upon it, including the £70,000 a year secured to the Agricultural Department under the Act of 1899, and that in 1917 there will be a loss on one side and a gain on the other. The loss will be this: the annuities at present amount to £160,000 a year, and they will be cut short by seven years. That will amount to over a million. On the other side of the account there may be a possibility in 1945 of three millions, because we prohibit the landlords from further redeeming. Beyond that it is impossible to go. There are so many problematical matters to be dealt with that it is impossible to arrive at definite figures, but as far as calculation and examination can go that will be the financial result. In addition to that there will be an immediate gain of £6,000 a year paid on the poor rate. Setting off these charges one against the other, as far as can be ascertained there will be no danger of this fund not being able to meet all the charges upon it, including the charge of £70,000 to the Agricultural Department, until 1945. It may be said that that is an uncertain calculation. I admit to a certain extent it is, but is the probability so strong as would prevent you doing an act of justice for the next forty-five years, and postponing redress because probably at the end of that period there may be a deficit? There will be no deficit as far as can be ascertained, and there is no reason whatever in withholding from these tithe-owners the redress to which they are entitled. Reference has been made to middlemen, and it is said that the landlords will get the tithes reduced and the middlemen will not. But the real object of this Bill is to give a system of revision, of which the tithe-owners were unjustly deprived in 1872. Everyone knows that the old system was cumbersome, expensive, uncertain in its results, and very often unsuccessful, because unless the applicant proved that the tithe rent-charge ought to be varied by 10 per cent. he got no redress, and was cast in costs. The automatic system we now propose is much fairer to the whole body of tithe-payers, and much more satisfactory generally.

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs): The House has just listened to a most ingenious defence of a Bill the main principle of which I submit is essentially unsound. The right hon. Gentleman has manifestly been rather hard hit by the suggestion that has been made not once but very frequently in the course of this debate, that this is another instance of the legislation with which we are familiar as proceeding from a Unionist Government, under which moneys belonging to the public and dedicated to public uses have been transferred from the public and from public uses to the benefit of a private class of individuals. The right hon. Gentleman denied that this was a dole, and he argued that it was a grievance that had failed to be redressed in consequence of a miscalculation which occurred in 1869. But the Bill of 1869 as originally framed was a Bill which provided for the redemption of tithe rent in a period of forty-five years, whereas as it ultimately became an Act of Parliament that period was extended to fifty-two years. Does the right hon. Gentleman really suggest that the Parliament of this country has been under a mistake of seven years in an Act of Parliament—that seven years having grown from forty-five to fifty-two, owing to something in the nature of a clerical error? Does he suggest for one moment that this Parliament in a large financial transaction of this kind, and receiving assistance from the highest actuary in the State, would have acquiesced in a blunder of that kind? For years the landlords of Ireland have been bringing forward this very suggestion of a miscalculation. In the Treasury Minute issued in 1895 it is stated that Lord Belmore asked in the House of Lords in June, 1894, whether the alteration made while the Irish Church Act of 1899 was in Committee was a result of a miscalculation, and he was informed, in reply, that there was no miscalculation. It was no miscalculation but deliberate action, and it is out of the question that the House should now be asked to revise a Parliamentary transaction which in the full knowledge of the Treasury at the time proceeded upon a correct calculation of the actuarial value of the transaction. I would ask, further, whether it is conceivable that a Unionist Government, which has been eleven years in office during the last fourteen years, should have allowed to continue a state of affairs in which injustice so gross was being perpetrated on any class of ratepayers, much less tithe rent-payers?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The injustice practically does not come into active operation until these annuities mature; but in the Land Act of 1896 it was provided that where annuities were redeemed they should be redeemed on the supposition that the charge must be paid off in forty-five years, not in fifty-two years.

MR. THOMAS SHAW: I entirely assent to that remark, but I observe with regard to it that it is no explanation at all. We have it on the authority of the Chief Secretary that he looks forward to 1917 as the year when these annuities will fall in. Again there was a statutory bargain in 1869, which was repeated in 1872. Was the miscalculation also made in the latter year? I wish to emphasise the point I make that Parliament proceeded with its eyes open in 1869 and in 1872. The third point was that this is not a compulsory scheme of redemption. No landlord has been compelled to redeem under these terms, but the landlords accepted these conditions and declared that it was a bargain. I am not misusing the word "bargain." In the face of the terms I say it was a bargain. It was a bargain not only for the landlord and tithe-rent owner, but a bargain in another interest altogether, and that is the Irish people, for whom the Land Commissioners, as the administrators of the Irish Church Fund, are trustees. That fund is now to be depleted by this rearrangement. I am not misrepresenting the position in the slightest degree. If I have shown that there was no grievance because there was no miscalculation, it follows necessarily that the attempt to create a grievance is a circuitous way of proceeding to justify the proposal now before the House. The next point stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland was that there was nothing bad in the introduction of the new principle of variability in reference to rent charges, because he says there is no principle in this at all. In one sense I agree with him, but I think you must have something to go upon if you are to introduce the precedent of variability. The principle of variability prior to the legislation of 1869 and 1872 was that there might be a reference back to the price of commodities by the consent of all parties, but that principle was found to be so circuitous in its operation, or difficult to appeal to, that in only a small percentage of cases—I think only one case per annum—during the whole period of this invariability was it ever appealed to at all. It is said that the principle is not bad, because something has to be restored. I have already dealt with that. I think nothing has to be restored, but if something has to be restored it should be in proportion to the reduction of the rent. In Ireland the tithe rent-charge is practically a fixed rent-charge. The rent-charge is now to be varied. I venture to say the principle now introduced is one of the most dangerous principles applicable to the charges and mortgages resting upon the real estate of this country that can possibly be conceived. The fallacy rests upon this. The Attorney General for Ireland states that tithe rent is a charge upon rent. That statement is an entire delusion in the sense in which it is used. When the rent on any property is reduced, the mortgagor on that property may look out for what was hitherto supposed to be an unimpeachable security, because his interest will be proportionally treated. I say this is a most dangerous attack upon the principles of sound finance applicable to real estate in this country. Another portion of the argument just delivered was to the effect that it could not be understood that this legislation was for the benefit of a class. Well, it is difficult indeed to answer a suggestion of that kind. For whose benefit is it? That is what I want to know. "Whose pockets is it to go into?" said one hon. Member, and there was no answer given. It necessarily goes into the pockets of the landlord interest. It is to benefit a class out of public money which ought to be devoted to public interests, and to public interests alone. It has been the habit of this House in dealing with large financial transactions of this kind that we should have the most accurate and detailed information as to the financial results of the operation upon which we are being asked to embark. What is the situation as actually described in the speech to which we have just listened? In a sense, my right hon. friend says, we are in the region of conjecture. We are now, in 1900, to be asked to legislate in the region of financial conjecture, one of the data of the problem being the year 1945, with a possible gain, forty-five years after the Act of Parliament, of three millions of money. That is not sound and proper treatment of the House of Commons when dealing with the finance of the matter. The legal quality of this impost called tithe rent-charge remains what it did under the Act of 1838. Upon what ground is it proposed to alter a state of things which has long remained undisturbed? The ground was an alleged miscalculation. Parliament dealt with this open-eyed, and with the fullest information at command. It is altogether a mistake to say that there was a miscalculation in the matter. It was a bargain voluntarily made by those who cannot break their bargain without Parliamentary sanction.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 175; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 165.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Rt. Hn. A. H. S- (Hunts
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bethell, Commander
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen, Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cornwallis, Fiennes S. W.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas-Pennant, Hon. E. S.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William H.
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Field, Admiral (Eastbourne)
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hamond, Sir Chas. (Newcastle)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hutchinson, Capt. G. W. Grice-
Jackson, Rt. Hn. W. Lawies
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swnsea
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Liverpool
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Sir Frederick George
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, Walter
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Newdigate, Francis Alexand'r
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbt. Pike (Darlingt'n)
Penn, John
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, R. (Lancs, Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. Curzon
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir Thos (Hartlep'l
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, James
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Rutherford, John
Sandon, Viscount
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Seely, Charles Hilton
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, T. H. (Stalybr.)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Billson, Alfred
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, P. Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Daly, James
Dewar, Arthur
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duckworth, James
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gibney, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hammond, John (Carlow)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Thomas J. (Wexford)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hogan, James Francis
Horniman, Frederick John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Crae, George
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
Maddison, Fred.
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morris, Samuel
Moss, Samuel
Murnanagh, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John

O'Keeffe, Francis Arthur
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh'e
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Thomas, Alf. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, J. (Durham, Mid)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hud'rsf'ld

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Main question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Tuesday next.

CHARITABLE LOANS (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended, further considered.

An Amendment made.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 29, at the end, to add the words 'and no higher interest than three per centum per annum shall be charged on any such note.'"—(*Mr. Murnaghan.*)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and negatived.

Other Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

COUNTY COURTS (INVESTMENT OF DEPOSITS) BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

CUSTOMS DUTIES (ISLE OF MAN) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; an Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On Motion for Adjournment—

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside) said he understood that the Housing of the Working Classes Bill would be the first Order on Monday. What would be the second Order?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I cannot at present answer the question of the hon. Member as to what will be the second Order on Monday, but I hope to be able to answer to-morrow. The first Order will be the Housing of the Working Classes Bill, which I apprehend will take some portion of the evening.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — HOSPITAL ARRANGEMENTS AT THE FRONT—MR. BURDETT-COUTTS'S CHARGES.

MR. J. A. PEASE asked when Members might expect the Papers promised that afternoon with respect to the medical service in South Africa and the treatment of soldiers wounded or suffering from disease.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sorry the House has been disappointed in not having the Papers I promised them in the course of the evening. I have spent much time in endeavouring to find an explanation why we have not got the Papers. They were certainly in type yesterday, and I am wholly unable to explain or excuse the delay. I have made arrangements that these documents shall all be circulated to Members with their ordinary Parliamentary Papers in the morning, and I hope that that will give hon. Members sufficient time to study them before they come down to the debate.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve of the clock.

[APPENDIX

APPENDIX.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. SESSION 1900.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

(Continuation of List given in preceding Volume.)

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Irish Land Commission (Rules),—Copy of Rules made by the Irish Land Commission, under The Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Act, 1899, dated the 21st May, 1900 [44 and 45 Vic., c. 49, s. 50 (3)]	14 June	100 sitting days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which Examinations shall be held for 1900 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6]	14 June	40 days
Endowed Schools Act, 1869, and Amending Acts,—Copy of Scheme under The Endowed Schools Act, 1869, and Amending Acts, for the Management of the Charity of William Price, in the Parish of Fareham, in the county of Southampton, founded by Will dated 24th August, 1721 [36 and 37 Vic., c. 87, s. 15]	14 June	Two months

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Prisons (Scotland) (Dietaries),—Copy of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland, under The Prisons (Scotland) Act, 1877, establishing new rates of Dietaries for the several classes of prisoners [40 and 41 Vic., c. 53, s. 58]	14 June	40 days
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of St. John's College, Oxford, under The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877, on 9th December, 1900, amending Statutes III. 1, III. 14, V. 4a, and XV. 2 of the Statutes of the College [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50]	18 June	12 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of Worcester College, Oxford, under the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877, on 24th January, 1900, amending Statute III. 16 of the Statutes of the College [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50]	18 June	12 weeks
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1901 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6]	20 June	40 days
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing Bangor, County Down, an additional place of Examination for Boys in 1900 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6]	20 June	40 days
Inebriate Reformatories (Rules for Management),—Copy of Regulations for the management of the Farmfield certified Inebriate Reformatory, Charlwood near Horley [61 and 62 Vic., c. 60, s. 21 (1)]	25 June	4 weeks (whilst the House is sitting)

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Public Records (Court of Exchequer),—Copy of a Schedule containing a list and Particulars of Classes of Documents connected with actions arising out of seizures of goods, etc., or for the recovery of penalties under Acts relating to the Customs or Excise, and other Process in matters relating to the revenue, which formerly were or ought to have been in the Office of the King's or Queen's Remembrancer of the Exchequer, and which are now in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [40 and 41 Vic., c. 55, s. 1]	26 June	4 weeks
Board of Education,—Copy of Draft Order in Council constituting a Consultative Committee of the Board of Education [62 and 63 Vic., c. 33, s. 5]	28 June	4 weeks

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

SEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1900.

JUNE 14—*JUNE* 28.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill
l. Committed, *June 19*, 409.

Aberdeen Police and Improvement Bill
l. 2R.* *June 18*, 410.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorganshire, Rhondda]
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 540.

Acetylene
Admixture with Air or Oxygen Gas—Explosives Act—Order in Council Presented, *June 18*, 257, 276.

Accidents
Railway Servants, *see* Railways—Accidents.

Accounts
Public Accounts, *see* that title.

Acland-Hood, Sir A. [Somerset, Wellington]
Army Estimates — Cost of Sweeping Chimneys, etc., *June 19*, 473.
Barrack Damages—Demand for a Penny Sent to South Africa, *June 19*, 493.

Admiralty
First Lord—Rt. Hon. G. J. Goschen.
Secretary—Mr. W. E. Macartney.
Lord of the Admiralty—Mr. J. A. Chamberlain.
(*see* Navy.)

Adulteration of Food Stuffs
Administration of the Food and Drugs Act
References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 817, 818, 819, 820.

Afghanistan
Ameer's Refusal to allow Export of Horses to and Import of Salt from India—Indian Government's Control
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 21*, 625.

Africa
British Protectorates—Appointment of Superintendent at the Foreign Office, Duties and Emoluments
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1130.

Africa, Central
British Protectorates, Vote for, *June 15*, 244—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Africa, East
- Ashanti, *see* that title.
- British Protectorates, Vote for, *June 15*, 244—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).
- Zanzibar, *see* that title.

Africa, South
- Cape Colony, Transvaal, etc., *see* those titles.
- South African War, *see* that title.

Africa, West
- Gold Coast, *see* that title.
- Waima Incident, *see* that title.

Agricultural Education
- Powers of Board of Agriculture
  - *O.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 43.

Agricultural Holdings Bill
- *c.* Report from Standing Committee on Trade, *June 21*, 637.
- Petitions, *June 14*, 3; *June 19*, 426.

Agricultural Labourers
- Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *see* that title.

Agriculture, Board of
- *President*—Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.
- Cattle, Meat and Produce Markets—Petition for Establishment in London, *June 14*, 3.
- Inclosure, etc., Expenses Act, 1868—Report Presented, *June 14*, 10.
- Transfer of Power to Board of Education
  - *Os.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 43; Sir J. Gorst, 120.
- Veterinary Staff
  - *Os.* Mr. Channing, *June 22*, 815; Mr. Long, 817.
- Vote for, *June 22*, 805—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles.)

Aides-de-Camp
- Army Officers acting as Aides-de-Camp to Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Regimental Training
  - *Q.* Col. Welby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1325.

Airdrie and Coatbridge Tramways Bill
- *l.* Report from Committee of Selection, *June 18*, 253.
  - Report from Select Committee, *June 25*, 875.

Airdrie, Coatbridge and District Water Trust Bill
- *l.* Report from Committee of Selection, *June 18*, 253.
  - Reported with Amendments, *June 26*, 1026.
  - Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *June 25*, 874.

Aldershot
- General in Command, Date of Appointment—Number of Troops, Sufficiency of Staff, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Jeffreys; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 623.
- Government Railway Siding—Erection of Shed
  - *Q.* Mr. Jeffreys; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 902.
- Heat Casualties during Manœuvres
  - Authority Responsible for, etc.
    - *Os.* Mr. Labouchere, *June 19*, 490; Mr. Wyndham, 492.
  - Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 480.
  - Food Rations—Examination of Haversacks and Water-bottles
    - *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1324.
  - Halting the Troops—General Officer's Orders
    - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 147.
  - Headgear, Unsuitable Headgear, and want of Proper Food—Authority Responsible, etc.
    - *Qs.* Mr. W. Redmond, Sir E. Gourley; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 143; *Q.* Sir J. Brunner; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 146; *Q.* Mr. Jeffreys; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 282.
    - Adoption of Suitable Headgear, etc.
      - *Qs.* Major Rasch, Mr. Bartley, Sir H. Vincent, Sir J. Kennaway; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 143, 145, 146, 147.
  - Hospital Stoppages — Pensions for Widows, etc.
    - *Q.* Sir J. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 623.
  - Inquiry
    - *Q.* Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 14*, 11; *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 284.
    - Report of Inquiry
      - *Q.* Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 143; *Q.* Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 283; *Qs.* Dr. Farquharson, Major Rasch; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 778.
  - Number of Cases in Hospital, Average duration of stay, etc.
    - *Q.* Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1125.
  - Number of Deaths, etc.—Headdress worn at Manœuvres in 1898
    - *Q.* Mr. Bartley; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 143, 146.
  - Responsibility and Penalties for Casualties, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 622.

[*cont.*

Aldershot—*cont.*
  Heat Casualties during Manœuvres—*cont.*
    Return March—Number of Casualties during march
      Q. Col. Dalbiac; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1324.
    Sudden Heat—Difference in Temperature between Sunday and Monday
      Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 147.
    Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *June 15*, 144; *June 18*, 282.
  Sewage Farm
    Os. Dr. Farquharson, Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 498, 500.

Alexandra Park Bill
  c. 2R.* *June 15*, 130.
  Petition for Bill—Examiner's Certificates referred to Standing Orders Committee, *June 18*, 250.
  Standing Orders, *June 22*, 738.

Allan, Mr. W. [Gateshead]
  Army
    Guns—New Field Guns, etc., *June 19*, 494.
    Half-pay and other Charges for Officers, *June 19*, 502.
  Boilers and Naval Ships—Water-tube Boilers
    "Europa"—Speed of Voyage to Australia, H.M.S. "Hell," etc., *June 15*, 149.
    "Hermes," H.M.S.—Breakdown, *June 28*, 1331.
    "Terrible," H.M.S.—Speed of Voyage from Hong Kong to Ta-ku, *June 28*, 1329.
  Piershill Barracks, Sanitary Condition, etc., *June 19*, 500.
  Tyne River, Defence of, *June 19*, 499.
  University College of Dundee—Grant-in-aid, etc., *June 15*, 202.

Allen, Andrew
  Land Purchase, Ireland—Sale of Holding at Irvinestown
    Qs. Mr. Murnaghan; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 22*, 789; *June 28*, 1343.

Alverstone of Alverstone, Baron
  New Peer—Introduced, *June 18*, 249.

Ambulance Wagons
  O. Mr. Round, *June 19*, 494.

America
  United States, *see* that title.

America, South
  Brazil, Chile, etc., *see* those titles.

Amsterdam
  Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Ancient Monuments Protection Bill
  l. Rep. June 26*, 1031.

Animals
  Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill, *see* that title.
  Landing of Foreign Animals—Orders revoking certain Orders Presented, *June 21*, 614; *June 22*, 740.
  Vivisection, *see* that title.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
  Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 18*, 356; *June 21*, 646.
  Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 710.

Anti-Foreign Rising in China
  see China.

Archæology
  British School at Athens, Grant-in-aid
    Os. Mr. Asquith, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 15*, 193.

Archdale, Mr. E. M. [Fermanagh, N.]
  Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1393.
  Ulster Poor Rate Collectors—Refusal to accept part-payment of Rate, *June 28*, 1343.

Ardglass
  Herring Fishery, Decrease in—Steam Trawlers within three-mile limit, etc.
    Qs. Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 25*, 917.

Argyll, Duke of
  Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father, *June 19*, 409.

Armaments
  Reserve of—Standard of Reserve
    Os. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 496, 497.

Army
  Secretary of State—Marquess of Lansdowne.
  Under Secretary—Mr. G. Wyndham.
  Financial Secretary—Mr. J. P. Williams.
  Aides-de-Camp to Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Regimental Training
    Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1325.
  Aldershot, *see* that title.
  Ambulance Wagons
    O. Mr. Round, *June 19*, 494.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Artillery, Royal—Lieutenants, Promotion Regulations
Q. Mr. C. E. Shaw; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 436; *Q.* Mr. Newdigate; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 779.

Barracks, *see* that title.

Bills relating to the Army, *see* their titles.

Boats and Vessels, Expenditure on
Os. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 496, 497.

Cadet Corps Regulations, Formation of—Special Department, proposed
Qs. Sir H. Vincent, General Laurie; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1124.

Clothing Factory, Sanitary Condition of
O. Capt. Norton, *June 19*, 493.

Commissions
Militia, *see* that title.

Promotion from the Ranks, *see* South African War.

Compassionate Allowances
Vote for, *June 19*, 503.

Contracts for Boots, Unsatisfactory Boots supplied to Troops in South Africa—Messrs. Samuel and Indian Contracts
Os. Mr. Channing, Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 866, 870.

Defence of the Empire, *see* that title.

Dogs, Training for Outpost Duty—Employment of Dogs in Continental Armies
Q. Gen. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 281.

Dual (Naval and Military) Organisation—Events in China, etc.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1123.

Education Establishments
Vote for, *June 19*, 501.

Education of Officers' Sons—Fees charged for Auxiliary Officers' Sons at Woolwich and Sandhurst
Q. Sir J. Woodhouse; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1123.

Engineers, Royal—Lieutenants' Promotion Regulations
Q. Mr. C. E. Shaw; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 436; *Q.* Mr. Newdigate; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 779.

Enlistment and Recruits
Recruits raised in 1899—Proportion Enlisted in Ireland
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 902.

Under-age Recruits, Discharge of
Dundass, D., Case of
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 903.

Army—*cont.*
Enlistment and Recruits—*cont.*
Under-age Recruits, Discharge of—*cont.*
Walsh, P., Case of
Qs. Capt. Donelan, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1327.

Esquimault Garrison, *see* that title.

Forage
Hay for South Africa, Purchase Abroad, etc.
Os. Mr. Strachey, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 476, 478.

Inspection of
O. Mr. Jeffreys, *June 19*, 479.

Vote for, *June 19*, 472—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Forage Cap—Heat Casualties during Manœuvres at Aldershot, *see* Aldershot—Headgear, etc.

Guns—New Field Guns, etc.
Os. Mr. Allan, *June 19*, 494; Mr. Wyndham, 495.

Headgear
Casualties from Sunstroke, Want of suitable Headgear, etc., *see* Aldershot—Heat Casualties.

Defective Headgear
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 480.

Insufficient Supply of Helmets
O. Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 485.

Sentimental traditions of particular Corps
O. Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 484.

Horses, *see* that title.

Hospital Accommodation for Soldiers invalided from South Africa—Case of Private Mitchell
Qs. Sir E. Gourley, Mr. Marks; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 616.

Hospital Accommodation in South Africa, *see* South African War—Medical Arrangements, etc.

Hussars, 8th—Absence of Officers on Special Duty
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 779.

Huts for South Africa and Home Service
O. Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 499.

India, *see* that title.

Ireland, *see* that title.

Lancers—Reserve Regiment at Ballincollig, Want of Equipment, alleged
Q. Lord Willoughby de Eresby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1325.

Meat Rations, *see* sub-heading Rations.

Medals, *see* that title.

Medical Arrangements in South Africa, *see* South African War.

Medical Establishments—Supplementary Estimate Presented, *June 28*, 1313.

Militia, *see* that title.

Miscellaneous Effective Services
Vote for, *June 19*, 501.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Nursing Sisters' Pensions, Increase of, proposed
Q. Mr. Boscawen; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 777.

Officers
Barrack Furniture—Officers furnishing their own Quarters, etc.
Os. Col. Kenyon-Slaney, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 467, 470.

Cost of living in the Army—Extravagance, etc.
Mr. Wyndham's Explanation, *June 19*, 470.

Half-pay Officers—Outfit Allowance
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 900.

Special Duty—Officers absent for more than a year, making Supernumerary, proposed
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 779.

(*see also* sub-headings Artillery, Engineers, Reserve of Officers, etc.)

Pay, Non-effective Pay and Allowances—List of exceptions to Army Regulations sanctioned in 1900 Presented, *June 18*, 256, 275.

Pensions and other Non-effective Charges for Warrant Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, Men, etc.
Vote for, *June 19*, 503.

Provisions
Meat, System of passing in Camps, Complaints as to Quality of Meat, etc.
O. Mr. Jeffreys, *June 19*, 472.

Vote for, *June 19*, 472—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Quartermasters and Adjutants, Pay of—Reserve Squadron in Ireland
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1125.

Rations—Meat Rations, Insufficient Allowance, etc.
Os. Maj. Rasch, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 475, 476; Gen. Laurie, 479.

Recruits, *see* sub-heading Enlistment and Recruits.

Regimental Titles—Bedfordshire Regiment Recruits, Number residing in Hertfordshire, Number of Men transferred from 4th Battalion, etc.—Return Presented, *June 22*, 775.

Reserve of Armaments and Equipment—Standard of Relief, etc.
Os. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 496, 497.

Reserve of Officers—Officers of Volunteer Corps, Outfit Allowance on rejoining Regular Army
Q. Col. Pryce-Jones; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 901.

Reserve Squadrons in Ireland—Pay of Quartermasters and Adjutants
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1125.

Army—*cont.*

Reservists on Active Service—Counting Service in Sections A, B, C, or D for Pensions, Serving on to complete 21 years' Service, etc.
Q. Mr. M'Kenna; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 777.

Reservists Recalled to the Colours—Separation Allowance for Mothers
Os. Mr. Galloway, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 474, 478.

Retired Pay, Half-pay, etc.
Vote for, *June 19*, 501.

Rifles and Rifle Ranges, *see* those titles.

Royal Reserve Battalions
Pay—Good Conduct Badges and Rate of Pay, etc.
Q. Mr Seely; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1126.

Rifles—Delay in issuing
Qs. Mr. Warner, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 281.

Salisbury Plain Manœuvres, *see* that title.

Separation Allowance—Wives not on the Strength, Mothers of Reservists, etc.
Os. Mr. Galloway, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 473, 478.

Soldiers—*for* collective heading, *see* Soldiers.

South African War, *see* that title.

Superannuation
Vote for, *June 19*, 503.

Supplies—Forage, Provision, etc., *see* those sub-headings.

Transport Service
Vote for, *June 19*, 449—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Uniforms
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 480.

Veterinary Department
O. Capt. Norton, *June 19*, 451.

Officers' Titles—Granting Military Titles without Prefix
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1125.

Transport of Horses to South Africa, etc.
O. Capt. Norton, *June 19*, 465.

Volunteers, *see* that title.

Wagons—Lighter Wagons, Supply of, from New Zealand, etc.
Os. Mr. Warner, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 461, 468.

Warlike and other Stores
Vote for, *June 19*, 493—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Wei-hai-wei Garrison, *see* China.

Workmen's Compensation Act
Extension to Soldiers
Q. Mr. M'Kenna; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 279; *Q.* Col. Pryce-Jones; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 920.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
  Workmen's Compensation Act—*cont.*
    Number of Men receiving Compensation, Amount of Compensation, etc.—Address for Return, *June 14*, 10.
  Works, Buildings, etc.
    Vote for, *June 19*, 498—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).
  Yeomanry, *see* that title.

Army Estimates
  Clothing Establishments and Services—£4,680,000, *Com.*, *June 19*, 480; *Rep.*, *June 22*, 866.
  Education Establishments — £113,800, *Com.* June 19*, 501; *Rep.* June 22*, 871.
  Miscellaneous Effective Services—£66,900, *Com.* June 19*, 501; *Rep.* June 22*, 871.
  Ordnance Factory Vote — Including in Army Estimates
    Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 19*, 503; Mr. Caldwell, 504.
  Pensions and other Non-effective Charges for Warrant Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, Men, etc.—£1,379,000, *Com.* June 19*, 503; *Rep.* June 22*, 871.
  Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies—£13,100,000, *Com.*, *June 19*, 472; *Rep.* June 22*, 866.
  Retired Pay—Half-Pay, £1,611,000, *Com.*, *June 19*, 501; *Rep.* June 22*, 871.
  Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, etc. — £186,000, *Com.* June 19*, 503; *Rep.* June 22*, 871.
  Supplementary Estimate, Additional Amount required for Medical Establishments Presented, *June 28*, 1313.
  Transport and Remounts — £10,000,000, *Com.*, *June 19*, 449; *Rep.* June 22*, 866.
  Warlike and other Stores, Supply and Repair — £8,000,000, *Com.*, *June 19*, 493; *Rep.* June 22*, 870.
  Works, Buildings, and Repairs, including Staff of Engineers — £2,670,700, *Com.*, *June 19*, 498; *Rep.* June 22*, 871.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O. [Belfast, W.]
  Army
    Reserve Squadrons in Ireland, Pay of Quartermasters and Adjutants, *June 26*, 1125.
    Royal Reserve Battalions—Delay in issuing Rifles, *June 18*, 282.
  Naval Ships and Water-tube Boilers—Performance of Ships fitted with Belleville Boilers, *June 28*, 1329.
  South African War—Settlement of Soldiers in South Africa after the War—Formation of Organisation in South Africa, *June 18*, 279.

Arran, Earl of
  Secretaries to Irish County Councils—Qualifications, Mayo County Council Case, etc., *June 26*, 1067.

Artillery, Royal
  see Army.

Arundel Port
  Annual Report and General Account of Commissioners Presented, *June 20*, 516; *June 21*, 576.

Ashanti
  Rising
    Coomassie, Investment of
        Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 28*, 1334.
      Deficient Provisioning of Garrison, Inadequate Relief Force, etc.
        Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 18*, 286.
      Names of Europeans—Health of Garrison, etc.
        Q. Mr. Stevenson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 19*, 443.
    State of Affairs—Giving Information to the House
      Qs. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 14*, 14.

Ashbourne, Lord—*Lord Chancellor of Ireland*
  Imitation of County Court Process Bill 2R., *June 22*, 743.

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir E. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
  Ashanti—Investment of Coomassie, Deficient Provisioning of Garrison, etc., *June 18*, 286.
  China — Anti - Foreign Movement—"Boxer" Rising, etc.
    British Forces, Command of—Co-operation of Japan with European Powers, *June 21*, 628.
    Chinese Government, Communications with, *June 25*, 903.
    Emperor of China—Position and Political Views, *June 25*, 905.
    Japanese Troops, Despatch of, to China, *June 26*, 1117.
    Russian Forces in North-Western China, alleged, *June 25*, 905.
    Tientsin, Relief of—Officers commanding land Forces, *June 26*, 1120.
  Turkey and Russia—Railway Concessions to Russia in Asia Minor, *June 21*, 627; *June 25*, 906.
  Turkish Fleet, Re-construction of—Contract for Material given to German Firm in consequence of Political Pressure, *June 21*, 626.

Asia Minor
  British Consular Establishments, Reduction, etc.
    Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 211.

[*cont.*

Asia Minor—*cont.*
- British Consular Establishments, Reduction, etc.—*cont.*
  - Tiflis
    - *Os.* Mr. Elliot, Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 243.
- Railway Concessions to Russia
  - *O.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 243; *Qs.* Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 21*, 627: *June 25*, 906.

Asquith Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife]
- Athens, British Archæological School, Grant-in-aid, *June 15*, 193.
- Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill, 3R., *June 22*, 760.
- Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 18*, 339, 359, 363, 365; *June 21*, 647.

Aston Manor Tramways Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *June 15*, 130.

Athens
- British Archæological School, Grant-in-aid
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 15*, 193.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1163.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]
- British Museum and the Irish Gold Ornaments—Discovery of Ornaments at Limavady—Irish Crown Solicitor's Statement, etc., *June 28*, 1349.
- Tithe Rent-charge
  - Arrears, Recovery of
    - Proceedings for Recovery, *June 28*, 1347.
    - Receivers, Appointment of—Cost of Proceedings, Fees, etc., *June 28*, 1347, 1348.
  - Redemption—Costs and Expenses, *June 28*, 1349.
- Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1418.
- Tramway (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1204.

Attendance at Schools
- Sir J. Gorst's Statement, *June 14*, 108.
  - *O.* Mr. E. Gray, 108.

Attorney General
- Sir R. B. Finlay.

Attorney General for Ireland
- Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.

Australasia
- Bounties—Colonies granting Bounties on Commodities
  - *Q.* Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 909.

Australasia—*cont.*
- Certificates of Free-board (Load Line) issued to Vessels registered in the Colonies—Recognising in this Country
  - Order in Council Presented, *June 18*, 257, 276.
- Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *see* that title.
- Western Australia—Fremantle as Port of Call for Mail Steamers
  - *Q.* Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.

Austria-Hungary
- Horses for the Army—System of obtaining instituted by Emperor Francis Joseph in 1866
  - References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 449, 453, 456, 457.

Automatic Couplings
- Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, *see* that title.

Avebury, Lord.
- Hours of Labour in Shops, Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, *June 21*, 601, 602.

Baden, Grand Duchy of
- Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Baghdad
- Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Bailey v. Plant
- Workmen's Compensation Act—Committal for Non-payment of Award, Judge's Decision
  - *Q.* Mr. M'Kenna; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1133.

Baker, Sir J. [Portsmouth]
- Marine Pensioners, Discharge of from Hospital—Case of Roberts, *June 26*, 1126.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *June 21*, 573.
- Standing Orders, *June 18*, 249.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
- Aldershot Heat Casualties—Supply of Sun Helmets, etc., *June 19*, 490.
- Art Objects, Purchase and Circulation of—Victoria and Albert Museum Department Organisation, etc., *June 15*, 173.
- British Museum and the Irish Gold Ornaments
  - Limavady, Discovery of Ornaments at—Irish Crown Solicitor's Statement, *June 28*, 1348.
  - Transferring to Ireland, *June 15*, 185.

[*cont.*

Balcarres, Lord—*cont.*
  Charity Commissioners' Staff—Increase proposed, *June 22*, 832.
  National Gallery, Danger from Fire—Proposed Isolation, *June 15*, 157.
  National Physical Laboratory, Erection of, in Old Deer Park, *June 15*, 192.
  Salisbury Plain Manœuvres—Manchester Volunteers, Commissariat Breakdown, etc., *June 21*, 621.
  South African War Medal Design, *June 22*, 838.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, E.]
  Ashanti Rising—Giving Information to the House, *June 14*, 14.
  Athens, British Archæological School, Grant-in-aid, *June 15*, 193.
  Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill, 3R., *June 22*, 758.
  Business of the House, *June 14*, 18; *June 15*, 159; *June 18*, 298; *June 19*, 448; *June 21*, 636; *June 26*, 1138; *June 28*, 1353.
    Appropriation of Private Members' Days, *June 18*, 299, 311, 320, 330.
    Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill—Granting special facilities for passing into Law this Session, *June 25*, 920, 921.
  Cardiff Treasure Trove, *June 19*, 448.
  China—Anti-foreign Movement, etc.
    British Forces, Command of, *June 21*, 629.
    Indian Native Troops, Despatch of to Hong-Kong—Expenses, etc., *June 18*, 288; *June 28*, 1333.
    Japan, Co-operation of, with European Powers, *June 21*, 629.
    Japanese Troops, Despatch of, to China, *June 26*, 1117.
  Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1183.
  Crown Ecclesiastical Preferments—Appointments and the question of Obedience to the Bishops, *June 22*, 791.
  Education (Scotland) Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 19*, 448.
  Indian Budget—Date of Introduction, *June 21*, 626; *June 22*, 784; *June 25*, 922.
  Inter-Parliamentary Conference at Paris—Leave of Absence for Members, *June 22*, 793.
  Irish Gold Ornaments in British Museum—Transferring to Ireland, *June 15*, 183.
    Correspondence between Treasury and Museum Trustees—Laying on the Table, etc., *June 22*, 792.
  Irish Nationalist Party and the Government—Alleged "Corrupt Bargain," Appointment of Mr. Gill, etc., *June 25*, 923.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
  Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1194.
  Naval Foreign Stations—Dual (Naval and Military) Organisation — Events in China, etc., *June 26*, 1123.
  Ordnance Factory Vote—Including in Army Estimates, *June 19*, 503.
  Parliamentary Voters — Alteration of Registration, *June 18*, 296.
  South African War—Medical Arrangements, Disorganisation, Inefficiency, etc.—Mr. Burdett Coutts's Charges apers, *June 28*, 1432.
    Roberts's, Lord, Statement, *June 28*, 1315, 1319.
  Supply—Date for Discussion of Principal Votes, *June 14*, 18.
  Treasure Trove—Treasury Minutes since 1837, etc., Laying on the Table, *June 21*, 635; *June 22*, 792.
  War Relief Funds Committee Report
    Opportunity for Discussion, *June 15*, 280.
    Recommendations, *June 28*, 1319.
  Welsh Sunday Closing Bill, Passing into Law this Session, *June 18*, 297.
  Workmen's Compensation Act—Extension to Naval and Military Servants, *June 18*, 280; *June 25*, 921.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Leeds, Central]
  Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 523.
  Constabulary, Royal Irish—Jubilee Fund, Ascertaining opinion of Members as to Fund retaining its present form, etc., *June 28*, 1345.
  District Councillors' Qualifications—Irish Labourers Acts, *June 25*, 918.
  Downpatrick Pretoria Relief Celebrations, *June 25*, 916.
  Dublin College of Science and Art, Date of Commencement of New Buildings, etc., *June 18*, 296.
  Evictions — Marquess of Lansdowne's Estate, Number of Ejectment Decrees granted, *June 28*, 1345.
  Intermediate Education Programme—Delay in Publishing, *June 14*, 17.
  Land Commission
    Allen's, A., Holding—Sale of at Irvinestown, *June 22*, 790; *June 28*, 1343.
    Clare Co.—Delays in fixing Fair Rents, *June 18*, 296.
    Killarney—Number of Cases, Date of Sitting, etc., *June 26*, 1137.
    Sales to Tenants under Section 40 of Land Act, 1896, *June 26*, 1138.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
- Local Government (Ireland) Bill, Intro., *June 21*, 637.
- Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, Intro., *June 21*, 637.
- National School Teachers
  - Examinations for Promotion, *June 25*, 915.
  - Killylea—Arrears of Result Fees, *June 21*, 636.
  - Results Fees, School Examined on or after April 1, 1900, *June 22*, 789.
- New Quay Water Supply, *June 25*, 916.
- Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill, Intro., *June 21*, 638.
- Rate Books, Omission of Names of Owners and Lessees, etc., *June 18*, 295; *June 28*, 1346.
- Rockcorry Petty Sessions — Granting Licence Transfer to Acting Magistrate, *June 28*, 1344.
- Steamer Communication between Kilrush and Foynes, *June 28*, 1346.
- Strangford Lough Lighthouse—Refusal of Irish Lights Commission to provide Light, *June 14*, 16.
- Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1354, 1391, 1410, 1411, 1426.
- Ulster Poor Rate Collectors—Refusal to accept part payment of Rate, *June 28*, 1344.

Baltic
- Waterway between Baltic and Black Sea—Report Presented, *June 26*, 1029.

Banbury, Mr. F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]
- Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 518, 519, 521.
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1179.
- Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 537.

Banns of Marriage
- *see* Marriage Act Amendment Bill.

Barrack Damages
- Deductions from Pay—Demand for a penny sent to South Africa, etc.
  - *O.* Sir A. Acland-Hood, *June 19*, 493.

Barrack Schools
- Elementary Education Bill, *June 21*, 676.

Barracks
- Cubicles, Lighting of Barrack Rooms, etc.
  - *Os.* Capt. Jessel, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 499.
- Furnishing Officers' Quarters, etc.—Burden of expense on young men joining the Army
  - *Os.* Col. Kenyon-Slaney, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 468, 470.

Barracks—*cont.*
- Piershill Barracks, Sanitary Condition, etc.
  - *Os.* Dr. Farquharson, *June 19*, 498; Mr. J. P. Williams, Mr. Allan, 500.
- St. George's Barracks and the National Gallery, *see* National Gallery.

Barcelona
- Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Barlinnie Prison
- Fines, Payment of, by Prisoners
  - *Q.* Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 26*, 1135.

Barnsley Corporation Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *June 25*, 889.
- Standing Orders, *June 18*, 266.

Bartley, Mr. G. C. T. [Islington, N.]
- Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, etc., *June 15*, 143, 146.
- Irish Gold Ornaments in the British Museum, Transferring to Ireland, *June 15*, 187.
- Jamaica Railway Debentures and the Income Tax—Additional Income Tax deducted from Dividends matured before January 24, *June 22*, 795.
- South African War
  - Casualty Lists at War Office—Attendance of Responsible Officer early in the morning, *June 19*, 435.
  - Ladysmith, Siege of — Imperial Government's Claim on Mayor for Food supplied from Military Stores, *June 15*, 141.

Bayley, Mr. T. [Derbyshire, Chesterfield]
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1178.
- Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 708.
- Zanzibar, Slavery in, Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc., *June 15*, 222, 234, 235.

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Bristol, W.]
- Budget Statement — Form of Balance Sheet, Lumping together Sums of National Outlay, *June 22*, 800.
- Crown Agents for the Colonies—Reduction of Commission, proposed, etc., *June 22*, 798.
- Crown Quit Rents, Ireland, *June 28*, 1336.
- Death Duties—South African War, Remission of Duties to Officers' Widows, *June 18*, 279.
- Income Tax—Jamaica Railway Debentures—Additional Income Tax deducted from Dividends matured before January 24, *June 22*, 796, 797.
- Savings Banks
  - Post Office Savings Banks—Deposit Accounts, *June 19*, 445.

[*cont.*

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H.—*cont.*
Savings Banks—*cont.*
Trustee Savings Banks Regulations—Consulting Inspection Committee, *June 28*, 1336.
Trustee and Post Office Savings Banks—Profit and Loss to the Treasury, *June 19*, 445.
South African War Medals, Design, etc., *June 22*, 838.

Beauchamp, Lord
Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill—Intervention by Lord Beauchamp
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 908; *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.

Beckett, Mr. E. W. [York, N.R., Whitby]
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1198, 1200.

Bedford Gas Bill
l. Rep. June 28*, 1265.

Bedfordshire Regiment
Recruits, Number of residing in Hertfordshire, Number of men transferred from 4th Battalion, etc.—Return Presented, *June 22*, 775.

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
c. Con., *June 20*, 516.
3R.* *June 20*, 525.
l. 1R.* *June 21*, 577.

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
Debate on Consideration as amended, and Third Reading, *June 20*, 516.
Act of 1882, 518, 519, 520.
Exemption of Existing Licences, 516, 520.
Licensing Justices, Powers of, etc., 518, 520, 521.
Off-Licences, etc., 517, 520.

Beirut and Coast of Syria
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Belfast and County Down Railway Bill
c. Rep. June 19*, 423.
*Con.** and 3R.* *June 25*, 889.
l. 1R.* *June 25*, 876.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1025.

Belleville Boilers
see Boilers—Water-tube Boilers.

Belper, Lord
Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill, *Com.*, *June 28*, 1269, 1270, 1271, 1272.
Burial Grounds Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1044.

Benefices
Crown Ecclesiastical Preferments—Appointments and the question of Obedience to the Bishops
Q. Mr. Gedge; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 790.

Bengazi
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Bermuda
Report for 1899 Presented, *June 26*, 1029.

Bethell, Commander G. R. [York, E.R., Holderness]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 958.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1201.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 548, 554, 560.
Zanzibar and Pemba, Slavery in—Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc., *June 15*, 240.

Bexhill and Rotherfield Railway Bill
l. Rep. June 28*, 1265.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. M. [Bethnal Green]
Slough Railway Accident, Official Report, etc., *June 21*, 632.

Bilbao and District
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Bill, Mr. C. [Staffordshire, Leek]
Leek Post Office—Insufficient Accommodation, *June 25*, 911.
Mails, Delivery of, in St. Helena—Delay in forwarding from Cape Town, *June 25*, 897.
Waima Incident—Progress of Negotiations, etc., *June 28*, 1334.

Bills
Private Bills, *see* that title.

Billson, Mr. A. [Halifax]
Volunteer Camps—Payment of Medical Officers, *June 21*, 624.

Birmingham Corporation (Stock) Bill
c. 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
Rep. June 25*, 891.

Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill
c. Con. June 18*, 269.
3R., *June 22*, 744.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 25*, 876.

Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill
Debate on Third Reading, *June 22*, 744.
Auditors, Power of Governors to appoint, 746.
Board of Education, 747, 749, 752, 754, 762.
Charity Commissioners, 748, 749, 754, 757, 761, 764.
Court of Chancery Jurisdiction, 746, 752, 754.
Educational System of Birmingham, 751.
Expenditure—Gradual replacement of capital expended on Buildings, 753, 755.
Governing Board, Constitution and Powers of, Qualifications of Trustees, etc., 746, 748, 751, 754.
Private Bill Legislation, 747, 752, 753, 756, 759.
School Property, Governors' Control over, 745, 748, 750, 753, 754, 758.
Appeal, Right of, 746, 751, 755.
University Property, 754.

Birrell, Mr. A. [Fife, W.]
British Museum Bill, *June 28*, 1351.
Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill 3R., *June 18*, 379.
Education—Religious Instruction, Ritualism, Parental Indifference, etc., *June 14*, 64.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 686, 719; *June 26*, 1199, 1200.

Bitlis
British Vice-Consulate — Reduction of British Consular Establishments in Asiatic Turkey
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 211.

Black Sea
Waterway between Baltic and Black Sea —Report Presented, *June 26*, 1029.

Blackpool, St. Anne's and Lytham Tramways Bill
c. Con. June 18*, 269.
3R.* *June 21*, 605.
l. 1R.* *June 21*, 574.
2R.* *June 26*, 1026.
Committed, *June 28*, 1265.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 874.

Blakiston-Houston, Mr. J. [Down, N.]
Strangford Lough and Carlingford Lough Lighthouses, etc., *June 26*, 1136.

Blind
Education of the Blind (Scotland) Bill, *see* that title.

Blocking Notices
Lowther's, Mr. J., Notice of Motion (Hospital Arrangements in South Africa)
Os. Mr. Lowther, Mr. Speaker, *June 28*, 1312.

Bloemfontein
Hospital Arrangements, *see* South African War—Medical Arrangements, etc.

Blundell, Col. H. B. H. [Lancashire, Ince]
Army Horses, Age of Horses Purchased, etc., *June 19*, 468.

Board of Agriculture
see Agriculture.

Board of Education
see Education.

Board Schools
Greenock Board School—Providing Prizes out of School Fund
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 28*, 1343.
Religious Instruction
Smith, Mr. S., on Ritualistic Practices, etc., *June 14*, 56—Sir J. Gorst's Reply, etc., 58.

Board of Trade
see Trade.

Boards of Guardians (Magistrates) Bill
c. 1R.* *June 18*, 408.

Boer Prisoners
see South African War—Prisoners.

Boer War
see South African War.

Boer War of 1881
Medals, Issue of, proposed
Q. Gen. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1322.

Boilers
Naval Ships and Water-tube Boilers
"Europa," H.M.S.—Speed of Voyage to Australia, Coal Consumption—H.M.S. "Hell," etc.
Q. Mr. Allan; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 15*, 149.
"Hermes," H.M.S.—Breakdown
Qs. Sir F. Flannery, Mr. Allan; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1330.
Performance of Ships fitted with Belleville Boilers, etc.—Statement
Qs. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1329.

[cont.

Boilers—*cont.*

Naval Ships and Water-tube Boilers—*cont.*
"Terrible," H.M.S.—Speed of Voyage from Hong Kong to Ta-ku
Qs. Sir F. Flannery, Mr. Allan; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1328.

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill—Bill Withdrawn, *June 27*, 1262.

Bootle

Ferry between Bootle and New Brighton
O. Mr. P. O'Brien, *June 25*, 886.

Boots

Army Contracts—Defective Boots supplied to Troops in South Africa—Messrs. Samuel's and Indian Contracts
Os. Mr. Channing, Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 866, 870.

Boscawen, Mr. A. S. T. G. [Kent, Tunbridge]

Army Nursing Sisters' Pensions, *June 22*, 777.

Midwives Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1254.

Militia
Army Commissions, Seniority of University Candidates, *June 22*, 780, 781.
Officers
Line Officers and Stoppage of Retired Pay on Embodiment, *June 19*, 501, 503.
Senior Major's Pay, *June 22*, 780.

Volunteers
Emergency Proposals for one Year only, *June 15*, 148.
Mounted Infantry—Capitation Grant, Rate of Camp Allowance, etc., *June 15*, 149.
Weekly Payment of Camp Allowances, etc., *June 15*, 148.

Bounties

Australian Colonies granting Bounties on Commodities
Q. Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 909.

Bowles, Mr. T. G. [Lynn Regis]

Army
Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, etc., *June 15*, 147; *June 18*, 284.
Horses—Supply of Remounts, etc., *June 19*, 452.
Soldiers' Headdress—Unsuitability of present Headdress, *June 19*, 482.

Asia Minor, Withdrawal of British Consuls, etc., *June 15*, 214.

British Museum
Grant-in-aid, Lump Sum Payments, Audit of Accounts, etc., *June 15*, 188.

Bowles, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*

British Museum—*cont.*
Irish Gold Ornaments, Transferring to Ireland, *June 15*, 182, 187.

Budget Statement, Form of Balance Sheet—Lumping together Sums of National Outlay, *June 22*, 801.

Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, *June 18*, 319.

Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, *June 22*, 797.

China, Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.—Admiral Seymour in Command of Land Force, Approval of the Admiralty, etc., *June 26*, 1118.

Crown Agents for the Colonies—Reduction of Commission proposed, etc., *June 22*, 797.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company (Annuities) Bill, *Com.*, *June 18*, 270; *June 19*, 417.

Marine Biological Association, Grant-in-aid, Insufficiency of Grant—Study of Sea Fish Life, etc., *June 15*, 190.

Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 716.

Navy
Training Squadron—Dismantling of Training Ships, etc., *June 26*, 1128.
Water-tube Boilers — Performance of Ships, *June 28*, 1330.

Parliamentary Debates, Defective Reporting, etc., *June 22*, 843.

Trawling—French Trawlers in British Waters, *June 19*, 444.

Woods and Forests Department—Source of Revenue, Expenditure, etc., *June 22*, 855.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 550, 563.

"Boxer" Disturbances in China

see China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.

Bradford Corporation Bill

l. 2R.* *June 21*, 573.

Standing Orders, *June 18*, 249.

Bray and Enniskerry Railway Bill

c. Rep. *June 22*, 768.

Bray Urban District Council Bill

c. Con. *June 26*, 1108.

Brazil

Report on State of Amazonas Presented, *June 28*, 1267.

Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Brecon Goods Yard

Fatality in—Board of Trade Inquiry
Q. Mr. Maddison; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *June 14*, 15.

Brewery and Commercial Investment Trust Bill
c. *Rep.* June 22*, 767.
3R.* *June 26*, 1108.

Brighton
Telegraphists' Efficiency Barrier—Case of Simmons
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 28*, 1341.

Bristol Water Bill
c. *Rep.* June 22*, 768.
3R.* *June 26*, 1108.

British Gas Light Company (Staffordshire Potteries) Bill
c. *Con.* June 15*, 130.
3R.* *June 19*, 421.
l. 1R.* *June 19*, 411.
2R.* *June 26*, 1026.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 874.

British Guiana
Annual Report Presented, *June 25*, 895; *June 26*, 1029.

British New Guinea
Report for 1898-99 Presented, *June 26*, 1029, 1114.

British Museum
Annual Return, Publication of
Q. Sir H. Howorth; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 634.
Extension, Plans for—Bequest, etc.
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 18*, 297.
Grant-in-aid, Lump Sum Payments, Audit of Accounts, etc.
References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 188, 189, 190.
Irish Gold Ornaments
Limavady, Discovery of Ornaments at—Statement of Irish Crown Solicitor
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 28*, 1348.
Restoring to Ireland
Correspondence between the Treasury and Museum Trustees, etc.—Laying on the Table
Qs. Mr. J. Morley; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 635; *June 22*, 791.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 179.
Legal Proceedings against Museum Trustees — Opportunity for Discussion, Title of Irish Trustees, etc.
Qs. Sir H. Howarth, Mr. S. Leighton, Mr. V. Gibbs; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 791.

British Museum—*cont.*
Irish Gold Ornaments—*cont.*
Restoring to Ireland—*cont.*
Treasure Trove — Treasury Minutes since 1837, etc., Laying on the Table
Qs. Mr. S. Leighton; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 21*, 635; *June 22*, 792.
Newspapers, Depositing Copies of Local Newspapers with Local Authorities—Opportunity for discussing Museum Bill
Q. Mr. J. Morley; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 18*, 297.
Vote for, *June 15*, 190—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

British Museum Bill
Q. Mr. J. Morley; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 18*, 297; *Q.* Mr. Birrell; *A.* Mr. J. Morley, *June 28*, 1351.
Petitions, *June 18*, 272; *June 26*, 1111.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
Burial Grounds Bill, *Con.*, *June 18*, 397.
Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 681.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 963, 974.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 535; *June 27*, 1211.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John—*Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Surrey, Guildford]
Africa—British Protectorates, Appointment of Superintendent at the Foreign Office, *June 26*, 1131.
Ashanti Rising—Coomassie Investment, Names of Europeans, etc., *June 19*, 444.
China
Anti-Foreign Movement, "Boxer" Disturbances, etc.
Chinese Government, Communications with, *June 25*, 903.
Concert of the Powers—Relations between Great Britain and Russia, *June 14*, 14.
Emperor — Position, Political Views, etc., *June 25*, 905.
Neu-Chwang — Protection of British Life and Property, *June 26*, 1121.
Peking—Safety of British Subjects, *June 19*, 443.
Russian Admiral in Command of Allied Naval Force, etc., *June 25*, 905.
Russian Forces in North-Western China, alleged, *June 25*, 905.
Seymour, Admiral, Relief of, etc., *June 28*, 1332.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John—*cont.*
- China—*cont.*
  - Anti-Foreign Movement, etc.—*cont.*
    - Statement, *June 14*, 12.
    - Ta-ku Forts, Capture of, etc., *June 18*, 287 ; *June 19*, 442 ; *June 20*, 572.
      - Ultimatum, Reported, etc., *June 25*, 904.
    - Tientsin
      - Bombardment, *June 22*, 781 ; *June 25*, 904.
      - Relief of, etc., *June 21*, 628 ; *June 26*, 1118.
        - Officers commanding Land Forces, *June 26*, 1120.
    - Warning of Rising, *June 26*, 1122.
  - British Shipping
    - Percentage of Chinese Trade carried by British Ships, etc., *June 26*, 1120.
    - Yang-tsze River — Number and Tonnage of British Ships employed, etc., *June 26*, 1120.
  - French Concession at Shanghai—Publication of Correspondence, *June 21*, 629.
  - Yang-tsze River, British Gunboats on—Additional number of Boats, *June 19*, 442 ; *June 26*, 1121.
- Consular Establishments in Asia Minor, Reduction, etc., *June 15*, 243.
- Foreign Office Papers—Advance Copies to the Press, Case of the *Morning Leader*, etc., *June 22*, 783.
- Macedonia, Northern—Increase of British Consular Staff, proposed, *June 28*, 1335.
- Morocco — European Intervention, proposed—Public Sale of Slaves, *June 18*, 288.
- Trawling—British South Coast Fisheries and Foreign Trawlers, *June 19*, 444.
- Turkey and Russia—Railway Concessions to Russia in Asia Minor, *June 15*, 243 ; *June 21*, 627 ; *June 25*, 906.
- Turkish Fleet, Reconstruction of — Contract for Material given to German Firm in consequence of Political Pressure, *June 21*, 627.
- Uganda Report—Illness of Sir H. Johnstone, *June 15*, 244.
- Waima Incident — Progress of Negotiations, etc., *June 28*, 1334.
- Zanzibar—Church Missionary Station at Rabais, etc., *June 15*, 153.
- Zanzibar and Pemba, Slavery in—Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc., *June 15*, 233, 242.

Brown, Mr. A. G. [Shropshire, Wellington]
- Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1077, 1079, 1093.

Brownrigg, Rev. Canon
- References to in Debate on the Education Vote, *June 14*, 54, 89.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
- Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, etc., *June 15*, 146.
- Education
  - Board of Education, Powers of
    - Distribution of Parliamentary Grant, Dismissal of Teachers, etc., *June 15*, 176.
  - Estimates, *June 15*, 168.
  - Teachers' Grievances, etc., *June 14*, 68.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
- Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 651.
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1146.
- Dismissal of Teachers, Training of Teachers, Charity Commissioners' Powers, etc., *June 14*, 124.
- Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1251.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R. [Aberdeenshire, E.]
- African Protectorates—Appointment of Superintendent at the Foreign Office, *June 26*, 1130.
- Indian Famine—Remitting Home Charges, *June 19*, 442.
- Indian Native Troops, Despatch of to Hong-Kong and China, Expenses and the Revenues of India, etc., *June 19*, 443.
- Privy Council—Salary of Registrar, etc., *June 22*, 803.
- Public Works Loan Commission, *June 22*, 840.
- Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, 3R., *June 21*, 661.
- Woods and Forests Department—Sale of Crown Salmon Fishing Rights, etc., *June 22*, 856.

Budget
- Form of Balance Sheet—Lumping together Sums of National Outlay
  - *Os.* Mr. Harwood, Sir M. H. Beach, Mr. G. Bowles, *June 22*, 798, 800, 801.
- Indian Budget, *see* India—Finance.

Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *June 21*, 573.
  - Committed, *June 28*, 1265.
- Standing Orders, *June 19*, 409.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
- South African War—Hospital Arrangements at Bloemfontein, *June 28*, 1318.
- (*see also* South African War—Medical Arrangements.)

Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill
- *see* Cremation Bill.

Burial Grounds Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *June 18*, 390, 400.
l. 1R.* *June 19*, 416.
2R., *June 26*, 1044.

Burial Grounds Bill
Debate on Consideration as Amended, Second and Third Readings, *June 18*, 390; *June 26*, 1044.
Act of 1880, 392, 395.
Allotment System
Barnstaple Cemetery, 391.
Freehold Rights, 390, 394, 397, 398, 399.
King's Lynn Cemetery, 391.
Rights of the Church of England, 392, 393, 395, 398.
Roman Catholic Privileges, etc., 391, 393, 396, 399.
Working of, 390, 394, 397, 399.
Chapels, Provision of, 1045, 1046.
Committee Report—Home Office and Local Government Board, Adjustment of Duties, 1047.
Consecration of Ground, 1045, 1046.
Consolidation of the Burial Acts, 1047.
Date upon which Act comes into operation, 400.
Fees, 1045, 1047.

Burial Grounds (Loans) (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *June 22*, 795.

Burmese Woman
Rangoon Outrage—Names of Officials responsible for failure of justice, etc.
Q. Sir L. M'Iver; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 22*, 784.

Burns, Mr. J. [Battersea]
Lunacy Administration — St. Pancras Scandal, *June 22*, 834.
Regent's Park Private Enclosures, Renewal of Leases, etc., *June 22*, 851.
St. Pancras "Lunacy Scandal"—Local Government Board Inquiry, *June 28*, 1339.

Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 425.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 888.

Business of the House
Appropriation of Private Members' Days Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *June 18*, 299—(*Division* : *A. 236* ; *N. 118*).
Matters of Urgency—Appropriation of Private Members' Days
Os. Mr. J. Lowther, Mr. Kearley, *June 18*, 302, 315.

Business of the House—*cont.*
Statements (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *June 14*, 18; *June 15*, 159; *June 18*, 298; *June 19*, 448; *June 21*, 636; *June 26*, 1138; *June 28*, 1353.

Butcher, Mr. J. G. [York]
Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1176.
District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 407.
Irish Nationalist Party and the Government—Alleged "Corrupt Bargain," Appointment of Mr. Gill, etc., *June 25*, 922.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1188.
South African War—Disaster to Imperial Yeomanry at Lindley, etc., *June 19*, 433; *June 25*, 899.

Butter
Presumptive Standards of Quality for Butter, Cheese, etc.
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Long, *June 28*, 1338.

Buxton, Mr. S. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
Local Government Provisional Order Bills—Distinctive titles, suggested, *June 19*, 416, 417.

Cabinet Ministers
Education Department Representation
O. Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 41.

Cable Communication
Irish Coast, Landing Cables on, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Hanbury, *June 15*, 248.
South African Telegrams, *see* South African War.
Subsidies to Telegraph Companies, Vote for, *June 15*, 247—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Cadet Corps
Military Lands, Use of by Cadet Corps for Military Purposes
O. Earl of Meath, *June 28*, 1293.
Regulations—Formation of Special Department, proposed
Qs. Sir H. Vincent, General Laurie; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1124.
Rifle Ranges—*see* Military Lands Bill.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanark, Mid]
Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 517.
Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill, 3R., *June 18*, 372.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Con.*, *June 25*, 1018.
Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 401.
Land Charges Bill, *Con.*, *June 18*, 387, 389.

Caldwell, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con., June 27*, 1226, 1228, 1231, 1240, 1246.
  Ordnance Factory Vote, Including in Army Estimates, *June 19*, 504.
  Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, 3R., *June 21*, 658.
  Salmon Fishery Rights in Scotland, Sale of, *June 22*, 865.
  Universities of Scotland—Government Grants-in-aid, etc., *June 15*, 203, 210.

Caledonian Railway Bill
  l. Rep. June 25*, 875.

Cambridge University
  Statutes Presented, *June 18*, 258, 276.

Cameron, Sir C. [Glasgow, Bridgeton]
  Barlinnie Prison—Payment of Fines by Prisoners, *June 26*, 1135.
  Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill, 3R., *June 18*, 371.
  Sheriffship of Ross and Cromarty—Mr. Smith's Parliamentary Candidature, *June 19*, 446.
  Trawling in Loch Fyne, Suppression of, *June 25*, 913.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. A. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
  Dundee University College—Grant-in-aid, etc., *June 15*, 205.
  Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill 3R., *June 18*, 376.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
  Army
    Headdress for Soldiers—Difficulties of securing Uniform and Practical Headdress, etc., *June 19*, 486.
    Horses, Supply of Remounts, etc. *June 19*, 453.
  Ashanti Rising, *June 14*, 14.
  Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, Prospects of Legislation during remainder of Session, etc., *June 22*, 300, 321.
  China—Anti-Foreign Rising, "Boxer" Movement, etc., *June 14*, 11; *June 18*, 287; *June 19*, 442; *June 26*, 1118; *June 28*, 1332.
    Ta-ku Forts, Capture of, etc., *June 20*, 572.
  Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com., June 18*, 367, 370; *June 21*, 658.
  Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com., June 25*, 937.
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill—Granting special Facilities for passing Bill this Session, *June 25*, 920.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*
  South African War—Hospital Arrangements at Bloemfontein—Mr. Burdett-Coutts's Charges, Inquiry, *June 28*, 1315.
  Zanzibar and Pemba, Slavery in—Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc., *June 15*, 238.

Camperdown, Earl of
  Marriage Act Amendment Bill, *Com., June 26*, 1055.

Canal Boats
  Marriage of Persons residing in—Marriage Act Amendment Bill, *June 18*, 262.

Canary Islands
  Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Canterbury, Archbishop of
  Burial Grounds Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1048.
  Marriage Act Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 259, 264; *Com., June 26*, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1055.
  Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 880, 882.

Cape Colony
  Mail Service to St. Helena—Delay in forwarding English Mails
    Q. Mr. Bill; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 897.
  Ministerial Crisis · Mr. Schreiner's Resignation
    Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 142.
  Observatory—Report of Astronomer Presented, *June 18*, 276; *June 21*, 575.
  South African War, *see* that title.

Caracas and District
  Trade Report Presented, *June 28*, 1267.

Cardiff
  Treasure Trove, Offer of, for Purchase to British Museum, etc.
    Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 19*, 448.

Carew, Mr. J. L. [Dublin, College Green]
  Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *Con., June 26*, 1070.

Carlingford Lough
  Lighthouse – Expenses, etc.
    Q. Mr. Blakiston-Houston; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1136.

Carson, Sir E.—*Solicitor General* [Dublin University]
  Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con., June 27*, 1227, 1241, 1252, 1253.

Catterline Episcopal School
- Dismissal of Head Mistress—Investigation proposed
  - *Q.* Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. H. Fisher, *June 14*, 15.

Cattle Diseases
- *see* Diseases of Animals.

Cattle, Meat and Produce Markets
- Petition for Establishment in London, *June 14*, 3.

Cavalry
- Horses—Supply of Remounts
  - Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 449.

Cawley, Mr. F. [Lancashire, Prestwich]
- Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 565, 566, 567.

Cayzer, Sir C. W. [Barrow-in-Furness]
- Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1250.

Cecil, Lord H. [Greenwich]
- Education—Religious Instruction, Ritualistic Practices, etc., *June 14*, 61.
- London School Board—Number of Recognised School places, Number of Unused Sites for Schools, etc., *June 26*, 1135.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Herts, Hertford]
- South African War
  - Reservists' Situations kept open—Reservists first soldiers to be sent home on conclusion of hostilities, *June 22*, 776.
  - Settlement of Soldiers in South Africa after the War—Skilled Artisans serving as Reservists, *June 22*, 777.

Celtic Ornaments
- *see* British Museum—Irish Gold Ornaments.

Census
- Liverpool, Alleged Inaccuracy—Report of Medical Officer
  - *Q.* Sir J. Willox; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *June 21*, 633.
- Wales—Papers containing Language column, etc.
  - *O.* Mr. H. Lewis, *June 22*, 840.

Central London Railway Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
  - Royal Assent, *June 22*, 873.

Central Telegraph Office
- Telegraphists—Punishment of, for exceeding Dinner Interval, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 22*, 786.

Chamberlain, Mr. Austen—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Worcestershire, E.]
- Marine Pensioners, Discharge of, from Hospital—Case of Roberts, *June 26*, 1127.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Birmingham, W.]
- Ashanti Rising, Investment of Coomassie, *June 28*, 1334.
  - Deficient Provisioning of Garrison, etc., *June 18*, 286.
- Australian Bounties, *June 25*, 909.
- Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill, 3R., *June 22*, 751, 761.
- Cape Ministry—Mr. Schreiner's Resignation, *June 15*, 142.
- Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 18*, 333, 341, 361, 362, 370; *June 21*, 639, 644, 654, 657, 658.
  - Intervention of Colonial Governors, *June 25*, 908; *June 26*, 1130.
  - Privy Council Appeal—Compromise Clause, *June 15*, 151.
    - Neglecting to consult Queensland Delegate, alleged, *June 15*, 152.
- Cyprus, Financial Condition—Conversion of Crimean Loan of 1855, etc., *June 15*, 246.
- Fremantle—Port of Call for Australian Mail Steamers, *June 26*, 1129.
- Gold Coast Colony—Concessions Ordinance, *June 25*, 909.
- Jamaica
  - Fruit and Mail Steamship Service—Grant-in-aid, *June 28*, 1334.
  - Rum, Excise Restrictions on—Omission of Reports in Returns, *June 25*, 908.
- Jameson Raid Indemnity — Great Britain's Claim by Right of Conquest, *June 15*, 142.
- Malta—Tunny Nets Tax, *June 15*, 151.
- New Zealand—Proposed Enlargement of Boundaries, Incorporation of Islands, *June 26*, 1129.
- South African War
  - Boer Prisoners at St. Helena—Presents, Tobacco, etc. — Exemption from Duty, *June 25*, 897.
  - Ladysmith, Siege of—Food supplied from Military Stores, Imperial Government's Claim on Mayor, *June 15*, 141.
  - Orange Free State Annexation—Lord Roberts's Proclamation, etc., *June 21*, 615; *June 28*, 1322.
  - Rebels in Cape Colony, Treatment of —Minute of Cape Ministry, *June 14*, 10; *June 21*, 616; *June 25*, 1115.
  - Settlement of Soldiers in South Africa after the War — Formation of Organisation in South Africa, *June 18*, 279.
- Tonga—British Protectorate, Proclamation of, *June 15*, 152.
- Transvaal—Miners' Return, etc., Sir A. Milner's warning, *June 28*, 1323.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
- Lord James of Hereford.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Sir M. Hicks Beach.

Channel Fleet
Shetland, Visit to, proposed
Q. Sir L. Lyell; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 18*, 285.

Channel Islands
Teachers' Superannuation—Legislation
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 21*, 630.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northampton, E.]
Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, Inquiry, etc., *June 14*, 11; *June 15*, 143; *June 21*, 622.
Boots supplied to Troops in South Africa, Unsatisfactory quality—Indian Contracts, etc., *June 22*, 866.
Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, *June 18*, 316.
Charity Commissioners—Sale of Charity Lands, etc., *June 22*, 827.
Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 674.
Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreaks, Restrictive Orders, etc., *June 22*, 814.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 926, 941, 952, 958, 961, 973, 994, 1016, 1018.
Indian Native Troops, Despatch of, to China and Hong-Kong—Expenses, etc., *June 28*, 1333.
Post Office Employees and Sunday Duty—Limit of Duty, etc., *June 18*, 294.
South African War
Orange Free State Annexation—Lord Roberts's Proclamation, etc., *June 21*, 615.
Rebels in Cape Colony, Treatment of—Minute of Cape Ministry, *June 21*, 615.

Chaplains
Naval Chaplains, Deficiency of—North American and West Indian Stations
Q. Mr. Peel; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1331.
Volunteer Camps—Capitation Grant
Q. Sir B. Simeon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 901.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 924, 925, 926, 930, 936, 937, 940, 950, 955, 958, 962, 964, 967, 968, 969, 972, 973, 974, 977, 978, 981, 982, 985, 988, 994, 995, 1001, 1003, 1005, 1011, 1013, 1017.
Liverpool Census Returns, Alleged Inaccuracy, *June 21*, 633.
Local Government Board—Appointment of Assistant Laboratory Clerk, *June 28*, 1340.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H.—*cont.*
Pauper Children
Boarding out—Number of Boards of Guardians boarding out Children, etc., *June 18*, 291.
Number of Boards of Guardians sending Children to Public Elementary Schools, etc., *June 18*, 291.
St. Pancras "Lunacy Scandal"—Local Government Board Inquiry, *June 28*, 1339.
Southall Schools, Expenditure on—Increased Accommodation, etc., *June 28*, 1339.

Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill
l. 2R.* *June 18*, 410.
Leave given to present Petition, *June 21*, 574.
Petition, *June 19*, 409.

Charitable and other Allowances
Vote for, *June 19*, 504.

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill
*c. Con.** *June 26*, 1203; *June 28*, 1431.

Charities
Endowed Schools, *see* that title.
Fareham—William Price Charity, Scheme for Management of Presented, *June 14*, 10; *June 18*, 259.

Charity Commissioners
Denominational Schools
O. Mr. Humphreys-Owen, *June 22*, 832.
Endowed Schools
Charity of William Price, Fareham, Scheme for Management Presented, *June 14*, 10; *June 18*, 259.
Report of Proceedings Presented, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 255.
Sale of Land, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 821.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *June 26*, 1134.
Schemes—"Odd and Fantastic" Schemes
O. Mr. J. C. Williams, *June 22*, 831.
Staff—Inadequate
O. Lord Balcarres, *June 22*, 832.
Transfer of Powers to new Board of Education
References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 42, 119, 126.
Statement—Duke of Devonshire, *June 26*, 1035.
Tydd St. Mary Charity
Os. Mr. Goddard, *June 22*, 824; Mr. Lawson, 828; Mr. Lloyd-George, 830; Mr. Humphreys-Owen, 832.
Vote for, *June 22*, 820—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their sub-headings).

Charlwood
  Farmfield Certified Inebriate Reformatory—Regulations for Management Presented, *June 25*, 878, 895.

Chelsea Commissioners
  South African War—Pensions for Disabled Soldiers, Extension of Powers
    Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 280.

Chelsea Hospital
  Vote for, *June 22*, 871.

Chichester, Bishop of
  Marriage Act Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 26*, 1056.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
  Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.

Children
  Coal Mines (Prohibition of Child Labour Underground) Bill, *see* that title.
  Education, *see* that title.
  Employment of—Casual Employment for Wages, Legislation proposed
    Q. Mr. Drage; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 25*, 912.
  Mortality among Infants—Midwives Registration Bill, *June 27*, 1255, 1258, 1259, 1260.
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bills, *see* their titles.
  Underfed—Sir J. Gorst's Statement, *June 14*, 30.
  Vagrants' Children Protection Bill, *see* that title.

China
  Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.
    Q. Earl of Kimberley; *A.* Marquess of Salisbury, *June 18*, 259; *Q.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 18*, 287.
    British Forces
      Command of
        Qs. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir J. Colomb; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 21*, 628.
      Indian Native Troops, *see* India—Army.
      Strength and Composition of—Number withdrawn from Ships, etc.
        Qs. Sir J. Colomb; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 23*, 782; *June 26*, 1119.
    Brodrick's, Mr., Statement, *June 14*, 12.
    Chinese Government, Communications with
      Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 25*, 903.
    Dowager Empress, Deposition of—Policy of the Government, etc.
      Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 14*, 11.

China—*cont.*
  Anti-Foreign Rising, etc—*cont.*
    Emperor of China—Position and Political Views
      Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 25*, 905.
    Indian Troops, *see* India—Army.
    Japan—Co-operation of, with European Powers
      Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 21*, 628.
    Japanese Troops, Despatch of, to China—Attitude of H.M. Government
      Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 26*, 1117.
    Neu-Chwang—Protection of British Life and Property
      Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1121.
    North-Western China—Russian Force marching on Urga, alleged
      Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 25*, 905.
    Peking Legations
        O. Mr. Brodrick, *June 18*, 287; *Qs.* Mr. H. Lewis; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 19*, 443; *June 21*, 628; *June 22*, 781.
      MacDonald's, Sir C., Position, etc.
        O. Marquess of Salisbury, *June 28*, 1268.
    Seymour, Adm., commanding allied Land Forces and Russian Adm. commanding allied Naval Forces
      Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 25*, 905; *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1118; *Q.* Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1119.
    Seymour's, Adm., Relief Force, Strength and Composition of, *see* sub-heading British Forces.
    Ta-ku Forts, Capture of, etc.
        Qs. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 19*, 442; *June 20*, 572.
      Ultimatum, Reported—Terms, etc.
        Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 25*, 904.
    Tientsin
      Bombardment of
        Q. Mr. H. Lewis; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 22*, 781; *Q.* Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 25*, 904.
      Relief of
          O. Mr. Brodrick, *June 27*, 1264; *Q.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 28*, 1332.
        Officers commanding Land Forces
          Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1120.

[*cont.*

China—*cont.*
Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.—*cont.*
Tientsin and Peking
Q. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1118.
Warning of Rising
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1122.
British Gunboats on the Yang-tsze—Additional number of boats for Protection of British Interests, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 14*, 11; *Q.* Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 19*, 442; *Qs.* Mr. Hedderwick, Mr. J. Walton; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1121.
British Shipping
Percentage of Chinese Trade carried by British Ships, Percentage of Duties paid
Q. Mr. Drage; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1120.
Yang-tsze River—Number and Tonnage of British Ships Employed on, etc.
Q. Mr. Drage; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1120.
British Trade with China, Value of, and Value of Trade of China with United Kingdom, Colonies, and India
Q. Mr. Drage; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 25*, 906.
Peking, *see* sub-heading Anti-Foreign Movement.
Shanghai, French Concession—Publication of Correspondence
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 21*, 629.
Trade Reports Presented, *June 18*, 254, 256; *June 28*, 1267.
Wei-hai-wei Garrison—Provision in the Estimates
Os. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 499.
Yang-tsze River
British Gunboats, *see* sub-heading British Gunboats.
Shipping Trade—Number and Tonnage of British Ships Employed, etc.
Q. Mr. Drage; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1120.

China Manufacture
Lead Poisoning, *see* that title.

Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways Bill
c. Con. June 15*, 130.
3R.* *June 20*, 505.
l. 1R.* *June 21*, 574.
2R.* *June 26*, 1026.
Committed, *June 28*, 1265.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 874.

Church Fund, Ireland
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *see* that title.

Church Missionary Stations
Rabais—Placing outside dominions of Sultan of Zanzibar
Q. Mr. Duckworth; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 152.

Church Preferments
Gift of the Crown—Appointments and the question of Obedience to the Bishops
Q. Mr. Gedge; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 790.

Church's Patent Bill
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

City of London Electric Lighting Bill
l. 2R.* *June 19*, 410.
Rep. June 26*, 1026.

City of London (Various Powers) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 19*, 410.

Civil Service
Superannuation
Appointments without Certificates—Treasury Minutes Presented, *June 15*, 137, 138; *June 18*, 257.
Royal College of Art, South Kensington — Instructor and Junior Inspector, Special Qualifications required—Treasury Minute Presented, *June 19*, 412, 432.
Sanitary Surveyor to Board of Trade—Special Qualifications required, Treasury Minute Presented, *June 15*, 138; *June 18*, 257.
Vote for, *June 19*, 504.

Civil Service Estimates
see Supply.

Clancarty, Earl of
Sat First in Parliament after the death of his father, *June 22*, 737.

Clare, Co.
Land Commission—Delays in Fixing Fair Rents
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 18*, 296.

Cleethorpes Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Clericalism and Education
Mr. S. Smith on, *June 14*, 47—Sir J. Gorst's Reply, 58.

Clerks of the Peace
Staffordshire—Increase of Pay
Q. Mr. Coghill; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 21*, 630.

Clontarf Urban District Council Bill
Joint Committee—Witness Ordered to Attend Committee, *June 21*, 605.

Clothing for the Army
see Army.

Clones
Level Crossing and Platform—Report of Inspector
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 25*, 913.

Coal Mines (Prohibition of Child Labour Underground) Bill
Petitions, *June 21*, 607.

Code Telegrams
Commercial Telegrams between England and the Cape—Removal of Restrictions
Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 436.

Coghill, Mr. D. H. [Stoke-upon-Trent]
Clerk of the Peace, Staffordshire—Increase of Pay, *June 21*, 630.

Cohen, Mr. B. L. [Islington, E.]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 934, 1006.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 548.

Coinage
Vote for, *June 22*, 838—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Colchester Camp
Rifle Range—Opening in time for Volunteer Training
Q. Mr. F. W. Wilson; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 438.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J.—*Under Secretary, Home Office* [Birmingham, Bordesley]
Vivisection—Motion for Return, *June 15*, 137.

Colomb, Sir J. [Great Yarmouth]
Armaments and Equipment, Reserve of, Expenditure by the War Office on Boats and Vessels, etc., *June 19*, 496.
China
Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.
British Forces, Command of, *June 21*, 629; *June 22*, 782.
Number withdrawn from Ships, etc., *June 26*, 1119.
Russian Admiral in command of allied Naval Forces—Admiral Seymour commanding Land Forces, *June 25*, 905; *June 26*, 1119.

Colomb, Sir J.—*cont.*
Esquimalt and Wei-hai-wei Garrisons—Provisions in the Estimates, *June 19*, 499.
Naval Foreign Stations—Dual (Naval and Military) Organisation — Events in China, *June 26*, 1123.

Colonial Contingents in South Africa
see South African War.

Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill
l. Com., *June 19*, 415.
Rep. June 21*, 602.
3R., *June 22*, 742.
c. 1R.* *June 22*, 794.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain.
Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Selborne.

Colonial Reports Presented
Annual Series, *June 25*, 895; *June 26*, 1029, 1114.
Miscellaneous Series, *June 25*, 895; *June 26*, 1029.

Colonial Services
Vote for, *June 15*, 245—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Colonial Solicitors Bill
l. 2R., *June 28*, 1279.

Colonial Stock Bill
l. 1R.* *June 25*, 878.

Colonies
Crown Agents—Reduction of Commission proposed, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, Sir M. H. Beach, *June 22*, 797, 798.
Trade with China, Value of, etc.
Q. Mr. Drage; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 25*, 906.
(*see also* names of Colonies.)

Colville, Mr. J. [Lanark, N.E.]
Opium Cultivation in India—Using land for the raising of food, proposed, *June 25*, 907.
Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, 3R., *June 21*, 664.

Commercial Telegrams
South Africa—Code and Cypher Telegrams, Removal of Restrictions
Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 436.

Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill
c. Rep. June 22*, 768.
3R.* *June 26*, 1108.

Commissions
- Crown Agents for the Colonies, *see* that title.

Committees
- Journal Committee Report—General Index Presented, *June 26*, 1030.
- Private Bills—Selection of Members, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Halsey, *June 25*, 919.
- Selection (Joint Committees)
  - Members discharged and Members appointed in substitution, *June 26*, 1139.
- Selection (Standing Committees)
  - Members appointed, *June 22*, 741.
  - Members discharged and Members appointed in substitution, *June 15*, 159; *June 19*, 448; *June 26*, 1138.
- Standing Committees—Chairmen's Panel Appointments, *June 25*, 923; *June 28*, 1353.
- Standing Committee on Law—Report from Committee of Selection, *June 22*, 794.

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill
- *c. Com.*, *June 18*, 333; *June 21*, 638.
- *Con.** and 3R.* *June 25*, 923.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 26*, 1030.

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill
- Debate in Committee, etc., *June 18*, 335; *June 21*, 638.
  - Appeal Question — Privy Council Appeal Amendment
    - Amended Compromise Clause, *June 18*, 338, 340, 342, 344, 355, 357, 366; *June 21*, 641, 642, 647, 650, 652.
      - Alternative Appeal—Rights of State Court, *June 18*, 346, 350, 352, 353.
      - Australian Governments, Opinions of, *June 21*, 640.
      - Canada—Right of Appeal, *June 18*, 366; *June 21*, 641, 643, 646, 648, 653.
      - Distribution of Legislative Powers between the Federal Government and the States—No Right of Appeal, *June 18*, 345, 349, 350, 351, 357; *June 21*, 646, 648.
        - Illustration from Canadian Cases, *June 18*, 345, 351.
      - Extent of Powers delegated in respect of External Questions — Right of Appeal, *June 18*, 345, 349; *June 21*, 648.
        - Illustration from Canadian Case, *June 18*, 345.

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill—*cont.*
- Debate in Committee, etc.—*cont.*
  - Appeal Question, etc.—*cont.*
    - Amended Compromise Clause—*cont*
      - High Court—Danger of impairing its Character, *June 18*, 358; *June 21*, 650.
      - New Zealand, Attitude of—Letter from Agent General, *June 21*, 643.
      - Opinions of Colonies—Difficulty of obtaining, *June 18*, 336.
      - Power of extending Right of Appeal — Granting to Federal Parliament, proposed, *June 18*, 358, 365.
      - Queensland, Attitude of, *June 18*, 336; *June 21*, 640.
      - Western Australia — Communication from Governor, *June 21*, 645.
    - Approval of Australian Premiers, *June 21*, 639.
    - Compromise Clause, *June 18*, 343.
      - Purport and Effect of, etc.
        - *Q.* Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 151.
      - Queensland Delegate, Neglecting to consult, alleged
        - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 152.
  - Bounties—Power to grant Bounties on Production and Export of Australian Goods, *June 21*, 657.
  - Colonial Governors' (Lord Lamington and Lord Beauchamp) Intervention
    - *Q.* Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 908; *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.
  - Objections to Amendment, *June 18*, 337.
  - Privy Council—Additional Members, proposed, *June 21*, 658.

Companies Acts Amendment Bill
- Petition, *June 15*, 132.

Companies Bill
- *c.* 2R., *June 26*, 1139.

Companies Bill
- Debate on Second Reading, etc., *June 26*, 1139.
  - Audit of Accounts, 1156, 1158, 1168.
  - Bogus Subscriptions, Allotment Return, etc., 1142, 1156, 1162, 1167, 1174.
  - Consolidation of Laws relating to Companies, suggested, 1153, 1158.

[*cont.*

Companies Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading, etc.—*cont.*
Date of Second Reading
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 14*, 17.
Debenture Holders, Rights of, Registration of Shares, etc, 1144, 1145, 1157, 1161, 1170, 1175, 1176, 1179.
Directors' Qualifications, 1140, 1142, 1149, 1155, 1158, 1162, 1164, 1166, 1169, 1171, 1176, 1178, 1179.
Investors, Protection of, 1141, 1147, 1155, 1163, 1166, 1175, 1176, 1178, 1179.
Joint Stock Companies, 1155, 1169, 1171, 1173.
Mortgages, Registration of, 1143, 1151, 1157, 1163, 1167, 1170, 1175, 1177.
"One Man" Companies, 1157, 1161, 1173, 1175.
Petition, *June 15*, 132.
Preference Creditors, 1144, 1152, 1164, 1168, 1170.
Prospectuses, Issue of, 1143, 1153, 1156, 1160, 1161, 1167, 1169, 1172, 1175, 1176.
Statutory Meetings, 1151, 1157, 1167, 1173.
Vendors and Promoters, Secret Payments to, etc., 1143, 1156, 1159, 1163, 1165, 1177.
Underwriting Shares, Commission to Underwriters, etc., 1143, 1157, 1169, 1174.
Winding-up
Frauds, etc., Examination of Companies' Affairs, suggested, 1140, 1150, 1152, 1166.
Mortgages, *see* that sub-heading.

Compassionate Allowances
Army Allowances, Vote for, *June 19*, 503.
Treasury Award, Vote for, *June 19*, 504.

Compensation for Injuries
see Workmen's Compensation Act.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
Downpatrick—Pretoria Relief Celebrations, Inquiry proposed
Q. Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 915.
Jubilee Fund—Ascertaining opinion of Members as to Fund retaining its present Form, etc.
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1345.

Consular and Diplomatic Service
see Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Contagious Diseases
Malta—Ordinance X. of 1898 Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Convicts
Penal Servitude Acts — Conditional Licences, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 257.

Cook Islands
Report for 1899 Presented, *June 26*, 1029.

Cooke, Mr. C. R. [Hereford]
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 552.

Coomassie
see Ashanti.

Cootehill
Postmastership—Applications and Appointment
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 914.

Cork Dock
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill, *see* that title.

Cork, Bandon and South Coast Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Cork Electric Tramways Bill
c. Rep. June 22*, 768.

Cornwallis, Mr. F. S. W. [Maidstone]
Searle's, Warder, Pension—Increase of, proposed, *June 26*, 1132.

Coroners
Jurisdiction of—Cremation Bill, *June 18*, 265.

Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited, Bill
l. 2R.* *June 21*, 573.
Committed, *June 28*, 1265.
Standing Orders, *June 19*, 409.

County Council Secretaries
Ireland, *see* that title.

County Councillors (Qualification of Women) (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 132; *June 21*, 607.

County Councils (Elections) Act (1891) Amendment Bill
l. Com. June 19*, 415.
Rep. June 26*, 1031.

County Courts
Imitation of County Court Process Bill, *see* that title.

County Courts Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 132.

County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill
- *c.* 2R., *June 18*, 401.
  - *Com.** *June 21*, 734 ; *June 28*, 1431.

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act
- Receipts and Payments—Accounts Presented, *June 21*, 576, 613.

County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill
- *l.* 2R., *June 22*, 743.
  - *Com.** and *Rep.** *June 25*, 885.
  - 3R.* *June 26*, 1058.

County Treasurers
- Ireland—Fee Fund Account Presented, *June 26*, 1030.

Court of Exchequer
- Documents of not sufficient value to justify preservation — Schedule Presented, *June 26*, 1030.

Courtney, Rt. Hon. L. H. [Cornwall, Bodmin]
- Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, *June 18*, 307, 323.
- Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 18*, 367.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1898) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 939.

Covered Vans
- Side Lights on
  - *Q.* Gen. Russell ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 18*, 292.

Cowes Pier Bill
- *c.* *Con.** *June 18*, 269.
  - 3R.* *June 21*, 605.
- *l.* Commons Amendts., *June 22*, 738.
  - Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Cremation Bill
- *l.* 2R., *June 18*, 264.
  - *Com.*, *June 28*, 1268.

Cremation Bill
- Debate on Second Reading and in Committee, *June 18*, 264 ; *June 28*, 1269.
  - Burial Authority—Definition, 1270.
  - Bye-laws
    - Penalties for breach of, 265.
    - Scope of, 265.
    - Secretary of State's approval, 265.
  - Cremation, Public Opinion as to, 265.
  - "Crematorium"—Definition, 1270.
  - Fees to be approved by the Home Secretary, etc., 265.
  - Gruesomeness of Title — "Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill," Alteration, proposed, *June 28*, 1269.

Cremation Bill—*cont.*
- Debate on Second Reading and in Committee—*cont.*
  - Home Secretary's Powers—Fees, Bye-laws, Plans of Places for Cremation, etc., 265.
  - Jurisdiction of Coroners, 265.
  - Nuisance, Creating or permitting, 265.
  - Penalty for false Declaration or false Certificate, 1271.
  - Plans of places for Cremation purposes to be approved by the Home Secretary, 265.
  - Private Crematoria, Home Office Regulations, 1270, 1271, 1272.
  - Rates, Enabling Burial Authorities to raise for purposes of Cremation, 265.
  - Scotland and Ireland, Application of Bill to, 265.

"Crematorium"
- Introduction of New Word into English Language
  - *Os.* Earl of Kimberley, Lord Belper, *June 28*, 1270.

Crimean Loan
- *see* Cyprus—Conversion of Crimean Loan.

Criminal and Judicial Statistics
- Ireland—Copy Presented, *June 20*, 515 ; *June 21*, 575.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Gloucester, Stroud]
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 944.
- Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 549.

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment Bill
- Petition, *June 15*, 132.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
- British Museum Extension—Plans, etc., *June 18*, 297.
- Catterline Episcopal School—Dismissal of Head Mistress, *June 14*, 15.
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1145.
- Training Colleges
  - Scotland—Admission, Qualifications, Queen's Scholarship Candidates' Grievance, *June 21*, 632.
  - Trained Teachers — Inadequate Supply, *June 21*, 631.

Cromwell Statue
- Erection of, within Precincts of Palace of Westminster without Consent of Parliament
  - Debate (Lords), *June 21*, 588.
  - Donor
    - *O.* Lord Morris, *June 21*, 596.
  - Petition for Removal, *June 21*, 577.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]
Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1181.

Crown Agents for the Colonies
Commissions—Reduction proposed, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, Sir M. H. Beach, *June 22*, 797, 798.

Crown Ecclesiastical Preferments
Appointments and the Question of Obedience to the Bishops
Q. Mr. Gedge ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 790.

Crown Lands
Purchase of Mineral Rights—Administration by the Woods and Forests Department, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 840.

Crown Quit Rents
Ireland—Application in aid of Local Taxation, proposed
Q. Mr. O'Keeffe ; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *June 28*, 1336.

Crown Rights in Salmon Fishing
Sale of, in Scotland
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 856.

Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill
c. Report from Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bill, *June 26*, 1109.

Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill
c. 2R.* *June 14*, 127.
Com. Rep.* and 3R.* *June 20*, 571.
l. 1R.* *June 21*, 577.

Crystal Palace Company Bill
l. Rep. June 25*, 875.

Cumberland County Council (Bridges) Bill
c. Rep. June 22*, 767.

Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill
c. 1R.* *June 18*, 333.
2R., *June 26*, 1203.
Com. Rep.* June 28*, 1431.

Cyprus
Annual Report Presented, *June 25*, 895 ; *June 26*, 1029.
Conversion of Crimean Loan of 1855
Os. Mr. Pierpoint, Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 245, 246.
Grant-in-aid
Vote for, *June 15*, 245.

Dairy Produce
Presumptive Standards of Quality—Report of Departmental Committee
Q. Mr. Hedderwick ; *A.* Mr. Long, *June 28*, 1338.

Dalbiac, Col. P. H. [Camberwell, N.]
Aldershot Manœuvres Heat Casualties, Return march—Number of Casualties during march, *June 28*, 1324.
Volunteers
Assistant Postmen's Camp Leave, *June 21*, 622.
Officers Gazetted to Army Commissioners—Refunding Outfit Allowance, *June 28*, 1326.

Daly, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1395.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 19*, 448.

Dangerous Trades
Lead Poisoning, *see* that title.

Dartmouth, Earl of
Military Lands Bill, *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1291.

Death Duties
South African War—Remission of Duties to Officers' Widows
Q. Gen. Russell ; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *June 18*, 279.

Debentures and Income Tax
see Jamaica—Railway Debentures.

Deceased Wife's Sister
Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill, *see* that title.

Defence of the Empire
Home Defences—Organisation of the Land Forces, Mobilisation of the Volunteers, etc.
Q. Major Rasch ; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 437.
Tyne, Defence of
O. Mr. Allan, *June 19*, 499.

Denbigh, Earl of
County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 22*, 744.
Irish Land Commission—Return of Expenses, *June 26*, 1058.
Secretaries to Irish County Councils, Qualifications, Mayo County Council Case, etc., *June 26*, 1069.

Denmark
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Deptford Victualling Yard
Overtime Records—Inaccurate System
Q. Capt. Norton ; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 26*, 1127.

Derbyshire Militia
see South African War—Sherwood Foresters.

Devonport Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 25*, 875.
Standing Orders, *June 21*, 573.

Devonshire Volunteers
Dockyard Employees—Civil Pay during Camp Training
Q. Capt. Norton ; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 901.

Devonshire, Duke of
Secondary Education Bill, Intro., *June 26*, 1031.

Dewar, Mr. A. [Edinburgh]
Edinburgh Post Office—Delay in Revision of Sorting Branch, *June 19*, 445.

Digby, Mr. J. K. Wingfield [Dorset, N.]
Yeomanry Adjutants' Pay Grievance, *June 25*, 900.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
Ashanti Rising—Investment of Coomassie *June 28*, 1334.
Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' days—Private Members' Grievances, Opposed Bills, etc., *June 18*, 303.
Cables—Landing Cables on Irish Coast, etc., *June 15*, 248.
Factories and Workshops—Date of issue of Chief Inspector's Report, *June 18*, 292 ; *June 19*, 447 ; *June 22*, 785.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 950.
India—British Cavalry Carbines, *June 15*, 153.
Jute Factory Regulations—Prosecution of Messrs. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1133.
Lead Poisoning—Returns, *June 21*, 629.
Local Government Provisional Order Bills—Distinctive titles, suggested, *June 19*, 417.
South African War
Farquhar's Farm Engagement—Field-state of 60th Rifles, *June 18*, 278.
Ladysmith, Siege of—Disappearance of Stores from Hospital, *June 15*, 140.
Supply
Date for discussion of principal Votes, *June 14*, 18.
Naval Shipbuilding Vote—Date of Introduction, *June 26*, 1127.
Uganda Report, *June 15*, 244.
West Indies—Increased Duties on British Goods, *June 15*, 245.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 527, 539, 542, 544, 546, 547.
Zanzibar, Slavery in, Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc., *June 15*, 216.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1091.
South African War
Hospital Arrangements at Bloemfontein—Mr. Burdett-Coutts' Charges, May 29, Communicating Letters to *The Times* previous to the War Office, Inquiry, etc., *June 28*, 1313, 1314.
Orange Free State—Lord Roberts's Proclamation of Annexation, *June 28*, 1322.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1359, 1360, 1364, 1365, 1405, 1418, 1422, 1423.

Diplomatic and Consular Service
Macedonia, Northern—Increase of British Consular Staff, proposed
Q. Mr. Stevenson ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 28*, 1334.
Reduction of Consular Establishments in Asiatic Turkey — Vice-Consulate at Bitlis, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 211
Tiflis
Os. Mr. Elliott, Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 243.
Vote for Consular Establishments Abroad, *June 15*, 211—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Diplomatic and Consular Reports
Trade Reports, *see* that title, *also* names of places.

Disabled Soldiers
see Soldiers.

Diseases of Animals
Destruction of Pens
Os. Sir C. Quilter, Mr. Long, *June 22*, 818, 820.
Foot and Mouth Disease, Swine Fever, etc., *see* those titles.
Landing of Foreign Animals—Orders revoking certain Orders, Presented, *June 21*, 614 ; *June 22*, 740.

Dissolution Prospects
Parliamentary Register
Q. Mr. Pickersgill ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 296.

Distress Abolition and Substitution Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 132.

District Councillors
Ireland—Labourers Purchasing Holding under Labourers Acts—Disqualification
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 918.

District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Bill
c. 2R., *June 18*, 407 ; *June 20*, 571.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *June 21*, 735.
3R.* *June 25*, 1023.
l. 1R.* *June 26*, 1030.

Docks
London Docks, Royal Commission of Inquiry—Constitution and Terms of Reference
Q. Mr. A. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 22*, 787.
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners, etc.) Bill, *see* that title.

Dockyard Employees
Devonshire Volunteers—Civil Pay during Camp Training
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 901.

Dogs
Army, Training Dogs for Outpost Duty proposed—Employment of Dogs in Continental Armies, etc.
Q. Gen. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 281.
Regulation (Ireland) Act, 1865—Accounts of Receipts and Expenditure Presented, *June 18*, 258, 275.

Dogs Regulation Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 3; *June 19*, 426.

Donelan, Capt A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Constabulary, Royal Irish—Jubilee Fund, Ascertaining Opinion of Members as to Fund retaining its present Form, etc., *June 28*, 1345.
Under-age Recruits—Discharge of—Case of P. Walsh, *June 28*, 1327.

Dorking Water Bill
c. 3R.* *June 14*, 1.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 18*, 252; *June 21*, 573.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Kent, St. Augustine's]
National Gallery, Dangers from Fire—Proximity of St. George's Barracks, proposed Isolation, etc., *June 15*, 158.

Doulath Khan
Petition for Redress of Grievances, *June 18*, 272.

Downpatrick
Pretoria Relief Celebrations—Action of the Police, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 915.

Drage, Mr. G. [Derby]
Children, Employment of—Casual Employment for Wages, Legislation proposed, *June 25*, 912.
China
British Shipping
Percentage of Chinese Trade carried by British Ships, etc., *June 26*, 1120.

Drage, Mr. D.—*cont.*
China—*cont.*
British Shipping—*cont.*
Yang-tsze River — Number and Tonnage of British Ships employed, etc., *June 26*, 1120.
British Trade Returns, *June 25*, 906.

Drunkenness
Ireland—Number of Cases, etc., Return Ordered, *June 25*, 896.

Dublin
College of Science—Date of Commencement of New Buildings
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 18*, 295.
Hospitals—Report of Board of Superintendence Presented, *June 18*, 256, 275.
Irish Gold Ornaments in British Museum, Transferring to Dublin, *see* British Museum.
Pawnbrokers—Return Presented, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 258.

Dublin Corporation Bill
Joint Committee — Witness Ordered to Attend Committee, *June 21*, 605.

Dublin Electric Lighting Bill
c. Con., *June 26*, 1070.

Dublin Electric Lighting Bill
Debate on Consideration as Amended, *June 26*, 1070.
Cost—Amount Expended by Private Company compared with sum paid by Municipality on purchasing in Leeds, Birmingham, Liverpool, etc., 1072, 1074, 1084.
Cost of Production and Supply by Municipalities and Private Companies Compared, 1073, 1075, 1082, 1090, 1093.
Dublin Corporation
Alleged Mismanagement, Excessive Charge, etc., 1075, 1077, 1079, 1081, 1084, 1087, 1089, 1094.
Borrowing Powers, etc., 1070, 1078, 1079, 1081, 1084, 1091.
Garcke's, Mr. Emile, Report, 1073.
Municipalities, Rights of, 1071, 1076, 1081, 1082, 1084, 1089.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 426.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 888.

Duckworth, Mr. J. [Lancashire, Middleton]
Zanzibar—Church Missionary Stations at Rabais, etc., *June 15*, 152.
Zanzibar and Pemba, Slavery in—Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc., *June 15*, 225, 237.

Duke of Edinburgh's Volunteer Rifles
Logan's, Mr., Gift of Maxim Gun and alleged Message
Q. Sir W. Lawson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 899.

Dundass, Daniel
Under-age Recruit--Discharge Refused
Q. Mr. W. Redmond: *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 903.

Dundee Harbour Bill
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Dundee University College
Government Grant-in-aid, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 196.

Dunkirk
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Earthenware Manufacture
Lead Poisoning, *see* that title.

East India
see India.

East India Railway Company
Contracts placed with German Firm—Employment of British Shipping, etc.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 18*, 288.

East London Water Bill
l. 2R.* *June 19*, 410.

East Stirlingshire Water Bill
c. Rep. June 26*, 1109.

Eastbourne
Schools — Limited Liability Company building
Os. Mr. Yoxall, *June 15*, 166; Sir J. Gorst, 172.

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill
c. 3R., *June 18*, 370.
l. 1R.* *June 19*, 416.

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 4; *June 15*, 132; *June 21*, 576, 607.

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill
Debate on Third Reading, *June 18*, 370.
Assessment of Rates, 373, 375, 377, 381, 383.
Dissenters, Rights of, 373, 375.
Established Church of Scotland, 376, 381, 384.
Exemption from Assessment and exclusion from Voting, 374.

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill *—cont.*
Debate on Third Reading—*cont.*
Kirk Session, Guarantee of Money by, etc., 374, 376, 377, 381.
Land
Real Rent, 373, 378.
Valued Rent, 374, 386.
Majority of two-thirds forcing minority to pay Rate, etc., 374, 384.
Small Feuars, Rights of, 372, 375, 378, 381, 382, 386.
Voluntary Rates, 378.

Edinburgh District Lunacy Board Bill
c. Rep. June 25*, 891.

Edinburgh
Post Office—Delay in Revision of Sorting Branch
Q. Mr. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 19*, 445.

Education
Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. Gorst.
Annual Statement (Sir J. Gorst), *June 14*, 20.
Average Attendance, 31, 108.
Block Grant System—Abolition of payment by Results, 21, 45.
Feeding Children, 30
Infants, Teaching of, 28.
Comments on Sir J. Gorst's Statement, 81, 86, 105, 122.
Inspectors
Duties of, 33.
Qualification, 8, 34.
Pupil Teachers, Supply of, etc., 22.
Comments on Sir J. Gorst's Statement, 36, 111.
Training Colleges
Denominational Colleges, 39.
Training Colleges, Supply of, 24, 39.
Remedy for want of Accommodation, 26.
Training of Teachers, 27.
Comments on Sir J. Gorst's Statement, 37, 111 125.
Block Grant—Abolition of Payment by Results
Gorst's, Sir J., Statement, *June 14*, 21.
O. Mr. S. Smith, 45.
Liverpool Grievance
O. Mr. D. MacIver, *June 14*, 76.
Board of Education
Agriculture, Board of, Transfer of Powers
Os. Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 43; Sir J. Gorst, 120.

[*cont.*

Education—*cont.*
- Board of Education—*cont.*
  - Charity Commissioners, Transfer of Powers to the Board of Education, References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 42, 119, 126.
  - Consultative Committee — Draft Order in Council Presented, *June 28*, 1267, 1312.
  - Departmental Report
    - *O.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 41.
  - Organisation of New Department
    - Statement (Duke of Devonshire), *June 26*, 1032.
  - Powers of—Distribution of Parliamentary Grant, etc.
    - *Os.* Sir J. Brunner, Sir J. Gorst, *June 15*, 176.
  - Reports Presented, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 255; *June 19*, 412; *June 20*, 516.
  - Secondary Education Branch—Assistant Secretary
    - *O.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 41.
    - Statement (Duke of Devonshire), *June 26*, 1039.
    - (*see also* sub-heading Secondary and Technical Education.)
  - Secondary Education Bill, *see* that title.
- Cabinet Minister—Representation of the Education Department in the House
  - *O.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 41.
- Child Labour—Casual Employments for Wages, Legislation proposed
  - *Q.* Mr. Drage; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 25*, 912.
- Code of 1900
  - Block Grant, *see* that sub-heading.
  - Gorst's, Sir J., Statement, *June 14*, 20.
- Elementary Schools in London—Number of recognised School places, Number of Children to be provided for, etc.
  - *Q.* Lord H. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 26*, 1135.
- Endowed Schools, *see* that title.
- Evening Continuation Schools—Encouragement to Local Authorities, etc.
  - *Os.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 44; Mr. S. Smith, 46; Sir J. Gorst, 120.
- Examiners—Salaries, etc.
  - *Os.* Mr. Goddard, *June 15*, 163; Sir J. Gorst, 170.
- Half-timers, Raising the Age
  - *O.* Mr. S. Smith, *June 14*, 46.
- Higher Grade Schools
  - Age Limit
    - *O.* Sir R. C. Jebb, *June 14*, 87.
  - References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 40, 84.
  - Secondary Education Bill, *see* that title.
- Industrial Schools, *see* Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

Education—*cont.*
- Infants, Training of, Kindergarten System, etc.
  - *O.* Mr. E. Gray, *June 14*, 107.
  - (*see also* sub-heading Annual Statement.)
- Intermediate Education Wales
  - Vote for, *June 15*, 190.
- Irish Questions
  - Intermediate Education
    - Programme—Delay in Publishing
      - *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 14*, 17.
    - Rule appointing places at which Examinations shall be held, Presented, *June 14*, 8; *June 18*, 258.
    - Rules and Programme of Examinations, Presented, *June 20*, 516; *June 21*, 576.
  - National School Teachers, *see* that title.
  - Roman Catholic University, *see* Ireland.
  - Science Teachers attending Summer Classes—Fees and Allowances
    - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 28*, 1350.
- Pauper Children, *see* that title.
- Payment by Results, Abolition of, *see* sub-heading Block Grant.
- Religious Controversy and the Education Department
  - *O.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 14*, 58.
- Religious Instruction—Ritualistic Practices in Elementary Church Schools and Board Schools, etc.
  - Parental Indifference
    - *O.* Mr. Birrell, *June 14*, 64.
  - Smith, Mr. S., on, *June 14*, 47—Sir J. Gorst's Reply, etc., 58.
- Report, Date of Issue—Presenting Report before Discussing Estimates
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Lewis; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 22*, 788.
- Schools Erected by Limited Liability Companies
  - References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 165, 166, 171, 175.
- Scotch Questions
  - Annual Report Presented, *June 20*, 515; *June 21*, 575.
  - Catterline Episcopal School—Dismissal of Head Mistress, Investigation proposed
    - *Q.* Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. H. Fisher, *June 14*, 15.
  - Greenock School Board—Providing Prizes out of School Fund
    - *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 28*, 1343.
  - Local Authorities, Allocation and Application of Technical Education Funds, etc.—Return Ordered, *June 19*, 432.
  - Stornoway Secondary Education School, Erection of—Withdrawing Grants from Relief of Rates for Educational Purposes.
    - *Q.* Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* A. G. Murray, *June 25*, 912.

Education—*cont.*
Scotch Questions—*cont.*
Training Colleges
Admission, Qualifications–Queen's Scholarship Candidates' Grievance
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 21*, 632.
Trained Teachers — Inadequate Supply
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 21*, 631.
Secondary Education Bill, *see* that title.
Secondary and Technical Education
Counties of Glamorgan and Warwick
Minutes sanctioning subjects to be taught, etc., Presented, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 255.
Establishment of Third Branch of Education Office for Secondary Education
Statement (Duke of Devonshire), *June 26*, 1033.
Local Authorities
Statement (Duke of Devonshire), *June 26*, 1031.
References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 40, 121.
Union of the Education and Science and Art Departments, *see* Secondary Education Bill.
Shorthand in Elementary Schools—Requirements
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 28*, 1338.
Teachers
Dismissal—Right of Appeal against Arbitrary Dismissal, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 67; *June 15*, 164.
Superannuation, Extending to Isle of Man and Channel Islands—Legislation
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 21*, 630.
(*see also* sub-heading Annual Statement.)
Training Colleges
Conditions of Admission—Nonconformist Grievance, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 53.
Curriculum for Rural Teachers, etc.
Os. Mr. Morrell, Sir J. Gorst, *June 15*, 177, 178.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 160.
Report for 1899 Presented, *June 21*, 575, 614.
(*see also* sub-heading Annual Statement.)
Training in habits of observation—American System, etc.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 14*, 22; Mr. S. Smith, 46.
Voluntary Schools, *see* that title.

Education—*cont.*
Vote for, *June 14*, 20; *June 15*, 159—(*for* subjects discussed *see* their titles, sub-headings under Education).
Including sum in one Vote
O. Sir F. S. Powell, *June 14*, 89.
Warned Schools—Return Presented, *June 19*, 431.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Brighton and Preston United District, etc.) Bill
c. 2R.* *June 19*, 421.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 267.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 18*, 253.
Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *June 25*, 875.
*Com.** *June 26*, 1029.
*Rep.** *June 28*, 1266.

Education of the Blind (Scotland) Bill
c. 2R.* *June 21*, 735.
Petition, *June 14*, 4.

Education (Scotland) Bill
Date of Second Reading
Q. Mr. Dalziel; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 19*, 448.
Petitions, *June 14*, 4; *June 18*, 272; *June 19*, 426; *June 20*, 505; *June 21*, 607; *June 22*, 770; *June 25*, 892; *June 26*, 1111; *June 27*, 1205; *June 28*, 1311.

Egerton, Hon. A. de T. [Cheshire, Knutsford]
Midwives Bill—Granting special Facilities for passing into Law this Session, proposed, *June 25*, 920.
Post Office, Transfer to Mount Pleasant, Rearrangements, Delays, etc., *June 21*, 735.

Elba
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Elections (Hours of Polling on Saturdays) Bill
c. 1R.* *June 14*, 128.

Electric Cable
London to Birmingham, *see* Telegraph Wires—Underground Wires.

Electric Lighting Acts
Proceedings—Board of Trade Report Presented, *June 22*, 740, 775.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. *Com.** and *Rep.** *June 21*, 575.
3R.* *June 22*, 739.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 27*, 1263.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. *Com.** and *Rep.** *June 21*, 575
3R.* *June 22*, 739.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
- *l. Com.** and *Rep.* June 21*, 575.
- 3R.* *June 22*, 740.
- Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
- *l. Com.** and *Rep.* June 21*, 575.
- 3R.* *June 22*, 740.
- Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *June 18*, 254.
- *c.* 1R.* *June 19*, 425.
- Memorandum Ordered, *June 21*, 614—Presented, *June 22*, 774.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
- *l.* Committed to Committee of the whole House, *June 18*, 253.
- *Com.* June 25*, 876.
- *Rep.* June 26*, 1028.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *June 18*, 254.
- *c.* 1R.* *June 19*, 425.
- Memorandum Presented, *June 22*, 774.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
- *Rep.* June 27*, 1263.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
- Standing Orders, *June 15*, 130.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *June 19*, 422.
- Memorandum Presented, *June 19*, 431.
- Standing Orders, *June 15*, 130.

Elementary Education
- *see* Education.

Elementary Education Bill
- *c.* 2R., *June 21*, 667.

Elementary Education Bill
- Debate on Second Reading, *June 21*, 667.
  - Barrack Schools, 676.
  - Boards of Guardians. Powers and duties of, 670, 672, 674, 676, 677, 679.
  - Building Grants to Denominational and Voluntary Schools, Grants out of Local Rates, Boards of Guardians' Control, etc., 669, 671, 672, 674, 679, 680.
  - Industrial Schools, Children not to be sent under charge of Policeman, suggested, 673, 680.
  - Pauper Children, 670, 671, 672, 675, 678.

Elementary Education Bill—*cont.*
- Debate on Second Reading—*cont.*
  - Voluntary Schools, etc., Audit of Accounts, 669, 672, 677, 679, 680.

Elliot, Mr. A. R. D. [Durham]
- British Consulate, Tiflis, etc., *June 15*, 243

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
- Cape Ministry—Mr. Schreiner's Resignation, *June 15*, 142.
- Great Indian Peninsula Railway Bill—Annuities, *Com., June 19*, 420 ; *June 21*, 604.
- Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill
  - Order Referring Bill to Special Committee, *June 21*, 603.
- South African War
  - British Forces—Number landed in South Africa, *June 19*, 434.
  - Colonial Contingents—Total Number landed in South Africa, etc., *June 28*, 1320.
  - Martial Law Statistics, *June 19*, 434 ; *June 25*, 1115.
  - Rebels in Cape Colony, Treatment of —Minute of Cape Ministry, *June 14*, 10 ; *June 26*, 1115.
- Vivisection—Motion for Return, *June 15*, 136.

Embassies and Missions Abroad
- Vote for, *June 15*, 211—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
- Oldham Corporation Bill, *Con., June 26*, 1105.

Endowed Schools Act
- Charity of William Price, Fareham—Scheme for Management Presented, *June 14*, 10 ; *June 18*, 259.
- Report of Proceedings of Charity Commissioners Presented, *June 14*, 9 ; *June 18*, 255.
- (*see also* Charity Commissioners.)

Engineers, Royal
- *see* Army—Engineers.

Enteric Fever
- *see* South African War.

Episcopal Schools
- Catterline Episcopal School, *see* that title.

Esquimalt Garrison
- Provision in the Estimates
  - *O.* Sir J. Colomb, *June 19*, 499.

Estate Duty
- *see* Death Duties.

"Europa," H.M.S.
Speed of Voyage to Australia—Coal Consumption, etc.—H.M.S. "Hell"
Q. Mr. Allan; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 15*, 149.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorganshire, Mid]
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 549, 560.

Evening Continuation Schools
Encouragement of, etc.
Os. Mr. Hobhouse, *June 14*, 44; Mr. S. Smith, 46; Sir J. Gorst, 120.

Evictions, Ireland
Lansdowne's Marquess of, Estate—Number of Ejectment Decrees granted
Q. Mr. T. J. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1345.
Summary Powers of Landlords—Communication to London Magistrates
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 28*, 1337.

Exchequer
Chancellor of the Exchequer, *see* Beach, Sir M. H.
Documents of not sufficient value to justify preservation — Schedule Presented, *June 26*, 1030.

Executors (Scotland) Bill
c. 2R.* *June 18*, 407.
Petitions, *June 18*, 272.

Experiments on Living Animals
see Vivisection.

Explosives
Acetylene in admixture with Air or Oxygen Gas—Order in Council Presented, *June 18*, 257, 276.
Inspectors' Annual Report Presented, *June 27*, 1208; *June 28*, 1267.

Factories and Workshops
Jute Factory Regulations—Prosecution of Messrs. Ritchie
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1133.
Report of Chief Inspector—Date of Issue
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 18*, 292; *Qs.* Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 19*, 447; *June 22*, 785.
Report Presented, *June 20*, 515; *June 21*, 576.

Factory and Workshops Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 4; *June 15*, 133; *June 18*, 272; *June 19*, 426; *June 20*, 505; *June 21*, 607; *June 22*, 770; *June 27*, 1205.

Falkirk Corporation Bill
*c. Rep.** *June 22*, 768.

Falkirk and District Water Bill
*c. Rep.** *June 25*, 892.

Falkland Islands
Annual Report Presented, *June 25*, 895; *June 26*, 1029.

Famine
see India.

Far East
see China, Japan, etc.

Fareham
William Price Charity—Scheme for Management of, Presented, *June 14*, 10; *June 18*, 259.

Farmers
Subsidising for Supply of Army Horses, proposed
References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 455, 456.

Farmfield Certified Inebriate Reformatory
Regulations for Management Presented, *June 25*, 878, 895.

Farnworth Urban District Council Bill
*c. Con.** *June 14*, 2.
3R.* *June 18*, 268.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Farquhar's Farm Engagement
see South African War.

Farquharson, Dr. R. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, Number of Cases in Hospital, etc. *June 26*, 1125.
Report of Inquiry, *June 22*, 778.
Barracks—Erection of New Barracks in Millbank, St. George's Barracks, National Gallery, etc., *June 19*, 498, 501.
Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreaks, etc., *June 22*, 808.
Midwives Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1259.
National Gallery, Danger from Fire—Proximity of St. George's Barracks, *June 15*, 157.
Soldiers' Headdress—Aldershot Casualties, Tight Tunics, etc., *June 19*, 488.
Wiltshire Volunteers—Dismissal of Sergt. J. King, *June 21*, 618.

Farrell, Mr. T. J. [Kerry, S.]
Marquess of Lansdowne's Estate—Number of Ejectment Decrees granted, *June 28*, 1345.

Fee Fund
Ireland—Account Presented, *June 26*, 1030.

Fenian Prisoners at Mafeking
see South African War—Martial Law.

Fenwick, Capt.
Sudan Medal
Q. Gen. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 620.

Fenwick, Mr. C. [Northumberland, Wansbeck]
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con., June 20*, 558.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
Aldershot — Heat Fatalities during Manœuvres
Defective Headgear, etc., *June 19*, 480.
Hospital Stoppages, etc., *June 21*, 623.
Army Forage, *June 19*, 479.
Jamaica Fruit and Mail Steamship Service—Grant-in-aid, *June 28*, 1333.
Promotions from the Ranks, Conditions—South African War, *June 21*, 619.

Ferries
Bootle and New Brighton
O. Mr. P. O'Brien, *June 25*, 886.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Dublin College of Science and Art, Date of Commencement of new Buildings, etc., *June 18*, 295.
Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *Con., June 26*, 1071.
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con., June 27*, 1237, 1248.
Science Teachers, Ireland — Summer Classes, Fee Grievance, *June 28*, 1350.

Field Service Equipment
Loss of—Compensation to Officers
Q. Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 433.

Fiji Islands
Incorporation in the New Zealand Colony
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.

Financial Relations, India and Great Britain
see India—Finance, Apportionment of Charge, etc.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney General* [Inverness Burghs]
Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com., June 18*, 347, 352, 353; *June 21*, 647, 651, 652, 656.
County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 401.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com., June 25*, 928, 938, 942, 964.
Land Charges Bill, *Con., June 18*, 389, 390.
Land Revenue Record Office—Public Inspection of Records, *June 19*, 447.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 716, 719.
St. Pancras Lunacy Scandal, *June 22*, 837.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con., June 20*, 542, 545, 547, 549, 550, 554, 559.

First Commissioner of Works
Rt. Hon. A. A. Douglas.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Rt. Hon. G. J. Goschen.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Fish
Sea Fish Life, Study of—Grant-in-aid to the Marine Biological Association, etc.
Os. Mr. Bowles, Mr. Hanbury, *June 15*, 190, 192.

Fisher, Mr. W. H.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Fulham]
Catterline Episcopal School—Dismissal of Head Mistress, *June 14*, 16.

Fisheries
Ireland
Annual Report Presented, *June 19*, 432; *June 21*, 575.
Trawling, *see* that title.
Malta—Tunny Nets, Imposition of Special Tax
Q. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 150.
Salmon Fishery, *see* that title.
Scotland
Fishery Board—Annual Report Presented, *June 14*, 8; *June 18*, 255; *June 28*, 1312.
Salmon Fisheries—Report Presented, *June 14*, 8; *June 18*, 255.
Scientific Investigations—Report Presented, *June 18*, 255.
Trawling, *see* that title.

Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Bill
c. 2R.* *June 25*, 889.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 266.

Fishguard Water and Gas Bill
c. 3R.* *June 14*, 1.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 18*, 252; *June 21*, 573.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. G. P. [Wilts, Cricklade]
British Museum—Grant-in-aid, Audit of Accounts, etc., *June 15*, 189.
Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill, 3R., *June 22*, 757.
Education—Dismissal of Teachers, Voluntary and School Board Systems of Education—Secondary Education Bill, etc., *June 14*, 96.
Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 676, 678.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 953, 957, 960, 967, 969, 1006.
Wiltshire Volunteers—Dismissal of Sergeant J. King, *June 21*, 617.

Fitz Wygram, Gen. Sir F. W. [Hants, Fareham]
Cavalry Officers—Instruction in Forage, etc., *June 19*, 475.

Flannery, Sir J. F. [Yorkshire, Shipley]
Naval Ships and Water-Tube Boilers
"Hermes," H.M.S. — Breakdown, *June 28*, 1330.
"Terrible," H.M.S.—Speed of Voyage from Hong-Kong to Ta-ku, *June 28*, 1328.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Kerry Mackerel Fisheries—Destruction of Nets by Steam Trawlers, etc., *June 25*, 918; *June 28*, 1349.
Killarney Land Appeals, Number of Cases, Date of Sitting, etc., *June 26*, 1137.
Penny-in-the-Slot Machines at Victoria Station, *June 28*, 1336.
Under-age Recruits, Discharge of—Case of P. Walsh, *June 28*, 1328.

Flower, Mr. E. [Bradford, W.]
Education—Tenure of Teachers, Poor-Law Schools, etc., *June 14*, 82.

Food Stuffs
Importation of Fraudulent Foodstuffs—Administration of the Food and Drugs Act, etc.
References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 817, 818, 819, 820.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease
Carcases thrown overboard — Carcases washed up on Shore
Os. Mr. Channing, Mr. Long, *June 22*, 816, 818.
Compensation for Slaughter of Cattle
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 808.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease—*cont.*
Outbreak in Norfolk and Suffolk, Restriction on Movement of Cattle, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 805.

Forage for the Army
Vote for, *June 19*, 472—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Foreign Goods
Importation of Goods bearing name of British Firms and English Words
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 910.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Marquess of Salisbury.
Under Secretary—Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick.
African Protectorates—Appointment of Superintendent, Duties and Emoluments, etc.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 26*, 1130.

Foreign Office Papers
Copies for the Press—Case of the *Morning Leader*
Q. Mr. B. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 22*, 783.

Foreshores
Removal of Gravel from Greystones
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 28*, 1335.
Wales—Leases, Policy of the Woods and Forests Department, etc.
O. Mr. H. Lewis, *June 22*, 863.

Foynes
Kilrush and Foynes, Steamer Communication between
Q. Mr. O'Keeffe; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1346.

Foster, Mr. H. S. [Suffolk, Lowestoft]
Foot-and-Mouth Disease Outbreak in Suffolk, Isolation of Cattle, Compensation Grievance, etc., *June 22*, 810.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 720.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 570; 3R., *June 27*, 1209, 1225.

Foster, Sir W. B. [Derby, Ilkeston]
Charity Commissioners—Sale of Charity Lands in 1899, *June 22*, 821; *June 26*, 1134.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 940, 947, 950, 955, 958, 961, 971, 973, 988, 1016.
Midwives Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1260.
St. Pancras Lunacy Scandal, *June 22*, 821.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, Report of Inquiry, *June 18*, 283.

[*cont.*

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H.—*cont.*
Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill, 3R., *June 22*, 749, 752.
Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, *June 18*, 309.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 934, 938, 958, 967.
Indian Famine—Imperial Grant, proposed, *June 19*, 440, 441.

France
China—French Concession at Shanghai, Publication of Correspondence
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 21*, 629.
Inter-Parliamentary Conference at Paris —Leave of Absence for Members
Q. Mr. Pierpoint; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 793.
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.
Waima Incident—Progress of Negotiations—Laying Despatch of March 29 on the Table
Qs. Mr. Bill, Mr. Hedderwick; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 28*, 1334.

Fraser Settled Chattels Bill
l. 2R.* *June 26*, 1026.

Free Board Load Line
Certificates issued by Government of South Australia to Vessels Registered in that Colony—Recognising in this Country—Order in Council Presented, *June 18*, 257, 276.

Fremantle
Port of Call for Australian Mail Steamers
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.

Friendly Islands
Incorporation in the New Zealand Colony
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.

Fruit Trade in Jamaica
Steamship Service—Grant-in-aid
Q. Sir J. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 28*, 1333.

Galloway, Mr. W. J. [Manchester, S.W.]
Army Separation Allowance—Soldiers' Dependents, Reservists' Mothers, etc., *June 19*, 473.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 526, 546, 548, 559, 563; 3R., *June 27*, 1217.

Gardens for School Children
Gorst's, Sir J., Statement, *June 14*, 33.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
*Rep.** *June 22*, 766.
*Con.** *June 25*, 890.
3R.* *June 26*, 1109.

Gas Light and Coke Company
Charges—Raising Price of Gas before serving Notice
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 25*, 909.

Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas and South Metropolitan Gas Companies Bill
c. *Con.** *June 14*, 2.
3R.* *June 18*, 268
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
l. *Rep.** *June 18*, 253.
3R.* *June 19*, 412.
c. 1R.* *June 21*, 606.
Memorandum Presented, *June 18*, 275.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill.
l. 3R.* *June 18*, 254.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 425.

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 22*, 765.
*Con.** and 3R.* *June 25*, 890.
l. 1R.* *June 25*, 877.
2R.* *June 26*, 1029.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1025.

Gedge, Mr. S. [Walsall]
Crown Ecclesiastical Preferments—Appointments and the Question of Obedience to the Bishops, *June 22*, 790.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 1011.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 714.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, 3R., *June 27*, 1218.

General Election
see Dissolution Prospects.

Genoa and District
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

German Colonies
Trade Report Presented, *June 26*, 1029.

Germany
Trade
Competition with Great Britain
East India Railway Company—Contract Given to German Firm
Q. Sir E. Vincent; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 18*, 288.
Turkish Fleet Reconstruction—Contract given to German Firm in consequence of Political Pressure, alleged
Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 21*, 626.
Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Gibbs, Mr. A. G. H. [London]
London Docks, Royal Commission of Inquiry — Constitution and Terms of Reference, *June 22*, 787.

Gibbs, Mr. V. [Herts, St. Albans]
Irish Gold Ornaments and the British Museum — Legal Proceedings against Museum Trustees, etc., *June 22*, 792.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 706.

Gill, Mr.
Appointment of—Alleged Bargain between Government and Irish Nationalist Party, *Morning Post* Statement
Q. Mr. Butcher ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 922.

Glasgow Building Regulations Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 425.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 888.

Glasgow Chamber of Commerce
Indian Famine Memorial
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 15*, 156.

Glasgow District Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 426.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Bill
c. Rep. June 22*, 768.
Con. June 27*, 1205.

Glastonbury Corporation Gas Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* *June 14*, 1.
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Glenesk, Lord
Marriage Act Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 26*, 1055.

Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *June 25*, 889.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 266.

Goa
Trade Report Presented, *June 26*, 1029.

Goddard, Mr. D. F. [Ipswich]
Burial Grounds Bill, *Con.*, *June 18*, 398.
Charity Commissioners—Tydd St. Mary Scheme, etc., *June 22*, 824.
Education — Examiners, Salaries, etc., *June 15*, 163.
Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 671.

Gold Celtic Ornaments
see British Museum—Irish Gold Ornaments.

Gold Coast Colony
Concessions Ordinance—Amendments and Third Reading of Bill
Q. Mr. Lloyd-George ; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 909.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.—*Vice-President of Council for Education* [Cambridge University]
Annual Statement, *June 14*, 20—Replies to Comments, 58, 119, 168, 172, 176, 178 —(*for* details, *see* Education).
Children, Employment of—Casual Employment for Wages, Legislation proposed, *June 25*, 912.
Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 678, 680.
London Elementary Schools—Number of recognised School Places, etc., *June 26*, 1135.
Religious Instruction—Ritualistic Practices, etc., *June 14*, 53, 54, 55, 58.
Report of Education Department—Date of Issue, *June 22*, 788.
Shorthand in Elementary Schools, *June 28*, 1338.

Goschen, Rt. Hon. G. J.—*First Lord of the Admiralty* [St. George's, Hanover Square]
Boilers—Water-tube Boilers, etc.
"Europa," H.M.S.—Speed of Voyage to Australia, Coal Consumption, etc., *June 15*, 149.
"Hermes," H.M.S. — Breakdown, *June 28*, 1330.
Performance of Ships fitted with Belleville Boilers, etc., *June 28*, 1330.
"Terrible," H.M.S.—Speed of Voyage from Hong Kong to Ta-ku, *June 28*, 1329.
Channel Squadron, Visit to Shetland proposed, *June 18*, 286.
Chaplains, Deficiency of—North American and West Indian Stations, *June 28*, 1331.
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.
British Forces, Strength and Composition of—Number withdrawn from Ships, etc., *June 26*, 1119.
Seymour's, Adm., Command of Land Forces, *June 26*, 1119.
Approval of the Admiralty, etc., *June 26*, 1118.
Manœuvres—Number and Class of Ships to be Employed, etc., *June 19*, 439.
Peckham Disturbance — Col. Whale's Attack on Roman Catholic Procession, *June 18*, 293.
Shipbuilding Vote—Date of Introduction, *June 26*, 1127.
Training Squadron—Dismantling of Sailing Ships, etc., *June 26*, 1128.

Goulding, Mr. E. A. [Wiltshire, Devizes]
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com., June 25*, 935.
- Volunteers, Wiltshire Regiment—Delay in issuing Rifles, *June 18*, 281.
- Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con., June 20*, 547, 568.

Gourley, Sir E. T. [Sunderland]
- Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, etc., *June 15*, 143.
- Hospital Accommodation for Invalided Soldiers returning from South Africa—Case of Private Mitchell, *June 21*, 616.
- Naval Manœuvres—Number and Class of Ships to be Employed, etc., *June 19*, 439.

Government Contracts
- Army Contracts, *see* Army.
- Contractors outside the United Kingdom, etc.—Return Ordered, *June 25*, 895.

Government Employees
- Dockyard Employees, *see* that title.

Government Property
- County of London—Return Presented, *June 21*, 613.
- Provinces—Contributions in lieu of Local Rates, Return Presented, *June 21*, 613.

Governments Stock and Other Securities Investment Company Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Gravel
- Greystones — Removal of Gravel from Foreshore
  - *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 28*, 1335.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, N.
- Education—Sir J. Gorst's Statement, Teaching of Infants, Training of Teachers, Religious Instruction, etc., *June 14*, 103, 115.

Great Berkhampstead Water Bill
- *c. Con.* June 14*, 2.
  - 3R.* *June 18*, 268.
- *l.* Commons Amendts.* *June 19*, 412; *June 25*, 874.

Great Central Railway Bill
- *c. Con.* June 18*, 269.
  - 3R.* *June 21*, 605.
- *l.* Commons Amendts., *June 22*, 738.
  - Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Great Eastern Railway Bill
- *l. Rep.* June 26*, 1026.
  - Committed, *June 18*, 250.

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill
- *l.* 3R* *June 21*, 573,
- *c.* 1R* *June 22*, 770.
- Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1107.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company (Annuities) Bill
- Committee, *June 15*, 131; *June 18*, 270; *June 19*, 417.
- Report, *June 21*, 603.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company (Annuities) Bill
- Debate in Committee, *June 19*, 417.
  - Expenses of Act and the Revenues of India, 418, 419.
  - Method of Purchasing Property, 418.
  - Period for which Annuities will run, 417, 419.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Stock
- Class D Annuities—Amount of Five per cent. Stock, Names of Trustees, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. L. Morgan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 25*, 907.

Great Northern Railway Bill
- *l.* Report from Committee of Selection, *June 18*, 253.
  - Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *June 22*, 738.

Great Northern Railway, Ireland
- Charges—Preferential Rates
  - *Q.* Mr. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1136.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill
- *c. Rep.* June 19*, 423
  - *Con.** and 3R.* *June 25*, 889.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 25*, 876.
  - 2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
- Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1025.

Great Western Railway Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *June 26*, 1026.
- Standing Orders, *June 18*, 249.

Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *June 19*, 411.

Greenock
- Board School—Providing Prizes out of School Fund
  - *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 28*, 1343.

Greenwich Hospital
- Income and Expenditure—Statement Presented, *June 21*, 576, 614.

Greystones
- Gravel, Removal of, from Foreshore
  - *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 28*, 1335.

Grocers' Licences, Ireland
Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *see* that title.

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Abolition Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 133.

Guiana, British
Annual Report Presented, *June 25*, 895; *June 26*, 1029.

Gull, Sir W. C. [Devon, Barnstaple]
Luggage, Excess Charges—South Eastern and Chatham Railway Charges, etc., *June 18*, 290.
Trawling—British South Coast Fisheries and Foreign Trawlers, *June 19*, 444.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 567.

Gully, Rt. Hon. W. C. [Carlisle]
see Speaker.

Gun Barrel Proof Act, 1868, Amendment Bill
*c. Rep.** *June 26*, 1109.

Guns
Field Guns—New Guns
Os. Mr. Allan, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 494, 495.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
Education—Education of Infants, etc., *June 14*, 81.
Jameson Raid Indemnity—Great Britain's Claim by Right of Conquest, *June 15*, 142.
Parliamentary Debates, *June 22*, 845.
Spinks, W., Case of—Walsingham Petty Sessions, *June 26*, 1134.
Uganda Native Troops, Removal to Somaliland, *June 15*, 245.

Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill
c. 2R.* *June 26*, 1108.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 266.

Haldane, Mr. R. B. [Haddington]
Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 18*, 341, 348, 350, 352, 353; *June 21*, 642, 646, 653.
Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill, 3R., *June 18*, 383.

Half-timers
O. Mr. S. Smith, *June 14*, 46.

Halifax Corporation Bill
*c. Con.** and 3R.* *June 18*, 268.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Attorney-General's Report Presented, *June 28*, 1265.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor*
Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 266.
Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill, 3R., *June 22*, 742.
Colonial Solicitors Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1279.
Cromwell Statue, Erection of within the Precincts of the Palace of Westminster without the Consent of Parliament, *June 21*, 595.
Imitation of County Courts Process Bill, 2R., *June 22*, 743.
Lunacy Administration—St. Pancras Scandal, *June 26*, 1064, 1066.
Marriage Act Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 263, 264; *Com.*, *June 26*, 1049, 1051, 1054, 1057.
Military Lands Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 580, 581.
Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Com.*, *June 28*, 1273.

Halsey, Mr. T. F. [Herts, Watford]
Private Bill Committees—Selection of Members, etc., *June 25*, 919.

Hamilton, Lord G.—*Secretary of State for India* [Middlesex, Ealing].
Afghanistan, Ameer's Refusal to allow Export of Horses to and Import of Salt from India—Indian Government Control, *June 21*, 625.
Army
British Cavalry—Proportion armed with Martini-Henry Carbine, *June 15*, 153.
Native Troops for China—Expenses, *June 19*, 443.
Troops withdrawn from Establishment for service outside India
English Officers with Native Regiments, etc., *June 26*, 1122.
Enlarging Establishment, Cost, etc., *June 26*, 1132.
Total Strength, etc., *June 21*, 626.
East India Railway Company, Contract with German Firm—Employment of British Shipping, etc., *June 18*, 289.
Famine
Advances to Native States, *June 19*, 440.
Imperial Grant, proposed, *June 15*, 156; *June 19*, 440, 441.
Number of Persons on Relief Works, etc., *June 15*, 153.
Rainfall, *June 26*, 1132.
Relief Organisation—Camp System of Distribution, etc., *June 19*, 441.
Royal Commission, Appointment of, *June 15*, 154.
Unburied Human Bodies devoured by Vultures, etc., *June 15*, 154.
Finance
Apportionment of Charge between India and the Imperial Exchequer, *June 21*, 625.

[*cont.*

Hamilton, Lord G.—*cont.*
  Finance—*cont.*
    Financial Statement — Explanatory Memorandum, *June 21*, 625.
  Great Indian Peninsula Railway Bill—Annuities, *Com.*, *June 19*, 418, 419; Report, *June 21*, 604.
  Great Indian Peninsula Railway Stock, Class D Annuities—Amount of Five per cent. Stock, etc., *June 25*, 907.
  Honnibal Shooting Case, *June 26*, 1131.
  Judicial and Executive Functions, Separation of—Memorial, *June 28*, 1333.
  Opium Cultivation—Using Land for the raising of Food, proposed, *June 25*, 908.
  Rangoon Outrage on Burmese Women by British Soldiers, *June, 22*, 784.

Hamilton Burgh Bill
  l. 3R.* *June 28*, 1266.
    Report from Committee of Selection, *June 18*, 253.
    Report from Select Committee, *June 22*, 738.

Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill
  l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 18*, 253.
    Report from Select Committee, *June 25* 875.

Hammond Company Bill
  l. Rep. June 25*, 875.

Hanchow
  Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Preston]
  Board of Trade Abstractors, Promotion of—Retention of Allowances, *June 28*, 1342.
  British Museum
    Annual Return, Publication of, *June 21*, 634.
    Extension—British Museum Bill, etc., *June 18*, 297, 298.
    Grant-in-aid, Audit of Accounts, etc., *June 15*, 189.
    Irish Gold Ornaments—Correspondence between Treasury and Museum Trustees—Laying on the Table, *June 21*, 635.
  Cables—Landing Cables on Irish Coast, etc., *June 15*, 248.
  Cootehill Postmastership — Applications and Appointment, *June 25*, 914.
  Customs (Isle of Man) Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1203.
  Factories and Workshops — Report of Chief Inspector, *June 19*, 447; *June 22*, 785.
  Foreign Goods bearing name of British Firm, Importation of, *June 25*, 910.
  Marine Biological Association Grant-in-aid, National Physical Laboratory at Kew, etc., *June 15*, 192.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*cont.*
  Parliamentary Debates — Verbatim Reports, etc., *June 22*, 841.
  Penny Post Extension to Orange River Colony and Transvaal, *June 21*, 620.
  Post Office
    Leek Post Office, Insufficient Accommodation, *June 25*, 911.
    Transfer of Work from General Post Office to Mount Pleasant—Delay in Delivery of Letters, *June 21*, 634, 735; *June 25*, 1023.
  Post Office Employees
    Counter-clerks and Telegraphists in London — Relief during Tea-time proposed, *June 22*, 786.
    Liverpool — Number of Temporary Sorting Clerks and Telegraphists, etc, *June 28*, 1341.
    Sunday Duty—Making Compulsory on all the Staff, Limit of Duty, etc., *June 18*, 294, 295.
    Volunteers — Assistant Postmen's Camp Leave, *June 21*, 622.
    W.C.D. Office Auxiliary Postmen and the Tweedmouth Report, *June 22*, 785.
  Privy Council—Salary of Registrar, etc., *June 22*, 804.
  Record Office — Appointment of Welsh-speaking Official, *June 22*, 839.
  Regent's Park Inclosures, Renewal of Leases, etc., *June 22*, 858.
  Scotch Questions
    Edinburgh Post Office—Delay in Revision of Sorting Branch, *June 19*, 446.
    Salmon Fishing, Sale of Crown Rights, *June 22*, 857.
    Universities — Dundee University College, Grant-in-aid, etc., *June 15*, 206.
  South African Mails, Delivery of in St. Helena—Delay in forwarding from Cape Town, *June 25*, 897.
  Telegraph Wires—Underground Wires, London to Birmingham Experiment—Extension to the North proposed, *June 18*, 294.
  Telegraphists
    Brighton—Efficiency Barrier, Case of Simmons, *June 28*, 1342.
    Central Telegraph Office—Punishment of Clerks for exceeding Dinner Interval, etc., *June 22*, 787.
    Liverpool—Inspectors of Telegraph Messengers, *June 28*, 1341.
    Telephone Service—National Telephone Company and the Post Office—Delivery of Telegrams over the Company's Wires, *June 25*, 911
  Wales
    Afforestation, *June 22*, 858.
    Mineral Rights, Sale of, etc., *June 22*, 857, 862.

"Hansard"
see "Parliamentary Debates."

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir W. G. V. [Monmouthshire, W.]
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1390, 1421.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 531.

Hardinge, Sir A.
Slave Trade in Zanzibar — Sir A. Hardinge's Attitude
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 216.

Hardwicke, Earl of
Cromwell Statue, Erection of within the Precints of the Palace of Westminster without the consent of Parliament, *June 21*, 588, 598.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
Yeomanry—Obsolete Arms, etc., *June 19*, 497.

Harrington, Mr. T. [Dublin, Harbour]
Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1204.

Harris, Lord
Poor Law Removal Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 879.

Hartlepool Gas and Water Bill
l. Rep. June 26*, 1026.

Harwich
Harbour Conservancy Board — Receipts and Expenditure, Abstract of Accounts Presented, *June 14*, 8 ; *June 18*, 258.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
Budget Statement, Form of Balance-sheet —Lumping together sums of National Outlay, *June 22*, 798.

Haslar Hospital
Discharge of Marine Pensioner Roberts in destitute condition — Suicide of Roberts, etc.
Q. Sir J. Baker ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1126.

Hastings Harbour Bill
l. 3R.* *June 18*, 251.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Hay for South Africa
see South African War—Forage.

Hazell, Mr. W. [Leicester]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 981, 982.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 729.
Morocco — European Intervention proposed, Public Sale of Slaves, *June 18*, 288.

Headgear for Soldiers
see Army, *also* Aldershot — Heat Casualties.

Healy, Mr. M. [Cork]
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1231, 1237, 1239, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1254.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1360, 1408.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Customs (Isle of Man) Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1203.
Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1087.
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1235, 1241, 1248.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1363, 1380, 1394, 1421, 1423.
Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1204.

Heat Casualties
Aldershot Manœuvres, *see* Aldershot.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 644.
National Telephone Company and the Post Office—Delivery of Telegrams over the Company's Wires, *June 25*, 911.
Penny Post—Extension to Orange River Colony and Transvaal, *June 21*, 620.
Transfer of Work from General Post Office to Mount Pleasant, Delay in Delivery of Letters, etc., *June 21*, 633.

Hebrides
Naval Recruiting—Training Ship at Portree, proposed
Q. Mr. Hedderwick ; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 913.

Hedderwick, Mr. T. C. H. [Wick Burghs]
China
Anti-Foreign Rising, Capture of Ta-ku Forts—Ultimatum, etc., *June 25*, 904.
French Concession at Shanghai—Publication of Correspondence, *June 21*, 629.
Yang-tsze River, British Gunboats on —Additional Number of Boats, *June 26*, 1121.
Dairy Produce—Presumptive Standards of Quality, *June 28*, 1338.
Naval Recruiting in the Highlands—Training Ship at Portree, proposed, *June 25*, 913.
Soudan, British Trade with—Statistics, *June 18*, 289.
Stornoway Secondary Education School Erection of, *June 25*, 912.
Waima Incident—Progress of Negotiations, etc., *June 28*, 1334.

"Hell," H.M.S.
Q. Mr. Allan; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 15*, 150.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, N.]
Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1182.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1402.

Heneage, Lord
Military Lands Bill, *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1285.
Volunteers Bill, *Re-com.*, *June 28*, 1284.

"Hermes," H.M.S.
Breakdown—Water-tube Boilers, etc.
Qs. Sir F. Flannery, Mr. Allan; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1330.

Herring Fishery
Ardglass, Decrease of Fishery—Steam Trawlers within three-mile limit, etc.
Qs. Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 25*, 917.

Hertford House
Vote for Wallace Collection, *June 15*, 190.

Higham Ferrars Water Bill
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Higher Grade Schools
see Education.

Highlands of Scotland
Naval Recruiting—Training Ships
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 913.

Highways and Bridges Act (1891) Amendment Bill
c. Com. June 27*, 1261.

Hoare, Mr. E. B. [Hampstead]
Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1154.

Hobhouse, Mr. H. [Somerset, E.]
Education—New Code, Higher Education New Board of Education, etc., *June 14*, 40.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 959, 970, 1011.

Hogan, Mr. J. F. [Tipperary, Mid]
Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill—Privy Council Appeal Compromise Clause, *June 15*, 151.
Fremantle—Port of Call for Australian Mail Steamers, *June 26*, 1129.
New Zealand—Proposed Enlargement of Boundaries, Incorporation of Islands, *June 26*, 1129.
Tonga—British Protectorate, Proclamation of, *June 15*, 152.

Holland, Mr. L. R. [Tower Hamlets, Bow]
Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1168.
Salisbury Plain Manœuvres—Manchester Volunteers, Commissariat Breakdown, *June 21*, 621.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Sir M. W. Ridley.
Under Secretary—Rt. Hon. J. Collings.
Vote for—Chief Inspector of Factories Report
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 19*, 447.
(*see also* Factories and Workshops.)

Honduras
Trade Report Presented, *June 28*, 1267.

Hong Kong
Garrison—Reinforcing with Indian Native Troops, *see* India—Army.

Honnibal Shooting Case
Inquiry
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 26*, 1131.

Hopetoun, Earl of
Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill, 2R., *June 19*, 413.

Horses
Army Horses
  South African War
    Cost of Transport, Average Cost per Horse, etc.
      Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 898.
    Number of Horses shipped to South Africa, Cost per head, etc.
      O. Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 457.
    Omnibus Horses, Appreciation of—Twice mentioned in Despatches
      O. Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 469.
  Subsidising Farmers
    O. Col. Welby, *June 19*, 455.
  Suitability of Horses purchased, etc.
    Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 499.
  Supply of Remounts, Purchasing *v.* Breeding
    Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 449.
  Veterinary Department, *see* Army.
  Vote for Remounts, *June 19*, 449.

Hospitals
Exemption from Rates
  Leave given to witness to attend Select Committee, *June 26*, 1030, 1139; *June 28*, 1354.

Hospitals in South Africa
see South African War—Medical Arrangements, etc.

Houldsworth, Sir W. H. [Manchester, N. W.]
- Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1236.

Hours of Labour in Shops
- Appointment of Select Committee of Inquiry
  - *Os.* Lord Avebury, Marquess of Salisbury, *June 21*, 601.

House of Commons
- Business of the House, Committees, etc., *see* those titles.

House of Lords
- Journal Committee Report—General Index Presented, *June 26*, 1030.
- Peers, *see* that title.
- Representative Peers, *see* that title.

Housing of the Working Classes
- Bills relating to, *see* their titles.

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill
- *c. Com.*, *June 25*, 923.
  - *Rep.* June 25*, 1021.

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill
- Debate in Committee, *June 25*, 923.
  - Area of Land attached to Workmen's Cottages, Increasing, 971, 972, 973, 974.
  - Borrowing Powers, 981, 1003.
    - Extension of time for Repayment of Loans, 981, 982, 983, 984, 987, 989.
  - Boundary Street Dwellings, 984, 985.
  - Cost of clearing Insanitary Areas, etc., 997, 999.
  - Insurance, 1011.
  - Ireland, Application of Bill to, 978.
  - Land
    - Cost, Compulsory Purchase Powers, etc., 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1017, 1018.
    - Hire of Land, Compulsory Powers, etc., 991, 994, 995, 998.
    - Leasing to third persons, 1004, 1006, 1007, 1008.
    - Purchase and Holding of Land, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 932, 934, 936, 937, 939, 941, 943, 944, 986, 1012.
  - Local Authorities, Powers of, 925, 926, 928, 929, 932, 936, 938, 939, 940, 942, 943, 948, 951, 952, 954, 955, 956, 961, 962, 967, 969, 971, 988, 991, 996, 1004, 1005.
    - Inquiries by Local Authorities, 954, 958, 959, 960, 961, 963, 964.
    - Right of Appeal against Local Authorities, 952, 967, 969, 970.
  - Local Government Board, Increasing Powers of, etc., 948, 951, 953, 956, 961, 971, 988.

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill—*cont.*
- Debate in Committee—*cont.*
  - London Borough Council, Powers of, 924.
  - London County Council Accounts—Separate Accounts, 997, 1001.
  - Rates, Liability of Unoccupied Land, Special Expenses, Rate, etc., 931, 977, 1014.
  - Re-housing Displaced Persons, 1000, 1001, 1012.
  - Rents, 983, 985, 986.
  - Workmen's Trains, etc., 986.

Howorth, Sir H. H. [Salford, S.]
- British Museum—Publication of Annual Return, *June 21*, 634.
- Irish Gold Ornaments and British Museum—Correspondence between Treasury and Museum Trustees, Laying on the Table, *June 22*, 791.

Hoylake and West Kirby Improvement Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *June 18*, 251.

Huddersfield Corporation Tramways (Recommitted) Bill
- *c. Con.* June 14*, 2.
  - 3R.* *June 18*, 268.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
  - 2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
- Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Hudson, Mr. G. B. [Hertfordshire, Hitchin]
- Education—Managers and Teachers, Right of Appeal, etc., *June 14*, 67.
- South African War—Brigade Signalling Officers, Increase of Pay, proposed, *June 21*, 619.

Humber Pilotage Commission
- Bye-laws—Order in Council Presented, *June 18*, 256, 276.

Humphreys-Owen, Mr. A. C. [Montgomery]
- Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill, 3R., *June 22*, 744.
- Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, Blocking Welsh Sunday Closing Bill, etc., *June 18*, 322.
- Charity Commissioners' Schemes, *June 22*, 832.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 960, 973.
- *Parliamentary Debates*—Reporting Verbatim, etc., *June 22*, 841.
- Record Office—Welsh-speaking Official, *June 22*, 840.

Hussars
- Eighth Hussars—Absence of Officers on Special Duty
  - *Q.* Col. Welby ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 779.

Huts
Supply of, for South Africa and Home Service
O. Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 499.

Hutton, Mr. A. E. [York, W.R., Morley]
Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 668.

Hydrographer
Admiralty Surveys—Report Presented, *June 18*, 276 ; *June 21*, 575.

Ilfracombe Improvement Bill
l. 2R.* *June 22*, 738.
Standing Orders, *June 19*, 409.

Imitation of County Court Process Bill
l. 2R., *June 22*, 742.

Inchiquin, Baron
Representative Peer for Ireland
Petition Claiming Right to Vote, *June 18*, 249.
Right to Vote established, *June 25*, 873.

Inclosures, etc., Expenses Act, 1868
Board of Agriculture Report Presented, *June 14*, 10 ; *June 18*, 258.

Income Tax
Jamaica Railway Debentures—Additional Income Tax deducted from Dividends matured before Jan. 24
Os. Mr. Bartley, *June 22*, 795 ; Sir M. Hicks Beach, 796, 797.

Incorporated Law Society
Grant-in-aid—Account Presented, *June 26*, 1115.

India
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Lord G. Hamilton.
Afghanistan, Ameer's Refusal to allow Export of Horses to and Import of Salt from India—Indian Government Control
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 21*, 625.
Army
British Cavalry—Proportion Armed with Martini-Henry Carbine
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 15*, 153.
China, Crisis in—Native Troops for China
Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 287.
English Officers attached to Native Battalions, etc.
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 26*, 1122.
Expenses
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 19*, 443 ; *Q.* Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 28*, 1333.

ndia—*cont.*
Army—*cont.*
Troops withdrawn from Establishment for Service outside India
Enlarging Establishment—Cost, Indian Army Charges, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 26*, 1131.
Total Strength — Replacing Troops, etc.
Q. Mr. Maclean ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 21*, 626.
Doulath Khan—Petition for Redress of grievances, *June 18*, 272.
Famine
Advances to Native States
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 19*, 439.
Home Charges Remission of, proposed
O. Mr. Buchanan, *June 19*, 442.
Imperial Grant, proposed
Q. Sir H. Fowler ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 19*, 440, 441.
Glasgow Chamber of Commerce Memorial
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 15*, 156.
Rainfall
Q. Mr. H. Roberts ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 26*, 1132.
Relief Operations—Papers Presented, *June 14*, 9 ; *June 18*, 255.
Relief Organisation—Camp System of Distribution, etc.
Q. Mr. Maclean ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 19*, 440.
Royal Commission of Inquiry proposed
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 15*, 154.
Statistics — Number of Persons on Relief Works, Number of Deaths from Famine and Plague, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 15*, 153.
Unburied Human Bodies devoured by Vultures—Dr. Kloptsch's Report, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 15*, 154.
Finance
Apportionment of Charge between India and the Imperial Exchequer
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 21*, 624.
Budget—Date of Introduction
Qs. Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. Maclean ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 21*, 626; *Q.* Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 784 ; *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 922.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
- Finance—*cont.*
  - Budget, etc.—*cont.*
    - Explanatory Memorandum, Date of Issue, etc.
      - *Q.* Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 21*, 625.
  - Income and Expenditure—Return Presented, *June 14*, 9; *June 21*, 614.
  - Loans Raised in India—Return Presented, *June 19*, 412, 431.
- Great India Peninsular Railway Stock, *see* sub-heading Railways.
- Honnibal Shooting Case—Inquiry, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 26*, 1131.
- Judicial and Executive Functions, Separation of—Memorial
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Lewis; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 28*, 1333.
- Land Revenue, Madras—Correspondence Regarding Sales of Defaulters' Lands Return Ordered, *June 26*, 1114.
- Opium Cultivation—Using Land for the Production of Food, proposed
  - *Q.* Mr. Colville; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 25*, 907.
- Progress and Condition—Statement Presented, *June 15*, 138; *June 18*, 257.
- Railways
  - Contracts for Material given to German Firm — Employment of British Shipping, etc.
    - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 18*, 288.
  - Great Indian Peninsula Railway Stock, Class D Annuities — Amount of Five per Cent. Stock, Names of Trustees, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. L. Morgan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 25*, 907.
  - Purchase of
    - Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company (Annuities) Bill, *see* that title.
    - Rate of Interest in Calculation of Annuities, etc. — Address for Copy of Correspondence between India Office and Bank of England, *June 18*, 277—Presented, *June 22*, 775.
  - Report as to Administration Presented, *June 28*, 1267, 1312.
- Rangoon Outrage on Burmese Woman by British Soldiers—Names of Officials Responsible for failure of justice, etc.
  - *Q.* Sir L. M'Iver; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 22*, 784.
- Trade with China, Value of, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Drage; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 25*, 906.

India Office
- Apportionment of Charge between India Office and Imperial Exchequer, *see* India—Finance.

Industrial Schools
- *see* Reformatories and Industrial Schools.

Inebriate Reformatories
- Farmfield Certified Inebriate Reformatory, Charlwood—Regulations for Management Presented, *June 25*, 878, 895.

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill
- *c.* 2R., *June 18*, 401; *June 21*, 734.

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill
- Debate on Second Reading, etc., *June 18*, 401.
  - Creating a "New Offence" to bring Inebriates within the Act, 402, 403.
  - Funds for Inebriate Homes—Public Health Rate, 402, 403, 404.
  - Petitions, *June 15*, 133; *June 21*, 607.

Infants' Schools
- Teaching of Infants
  - Sir J. Gorst's Statement, *June 14*, 28—Comments on, 81, 86, 105, 122.

Inoculation against Enteric Fever
- South African War, *see* that title—Enteric Fever.

Intercessory Prayers
- *see* South African War—Prayers.

Inter-Parliamentary Conference
- Paris—Leave of Absence for Members
  - *Q.* Mr. Pierpoint; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 793.

Intermediate Education
- *see* Education, sub-heading Irish Question, etc.

Intoxicating Liquors (Local Veto) (Ireland) Bill
- *c.* Bill Withdrawn, *June 20*, 571.

Invalided Soldiers
- *see* Soldiers—Disabled Soldiers.

Ireland
- *Lord Lieutenant*—Earl Cadogan.
- *Lord Chancellor*—Lord Ashbourne.
- *Chief Secretary*—Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.
- *Attorney General*—Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.
- *Solicitor General*—Mr. D. P. Barton.
- *Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture* — Rt. Hon. H. C. Plunkett.
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Board, Appointment of Mr. Gill—Nationalist Party and the Government, alleged "Corrupt Bargain"
  - *Q.* Mr. Butcher; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 922.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Allen's, A., Holding—Sale of, at Irvinestown
Qs. Mr. Murnaghan; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 22*, 789; *June 28*, 1343.

Ardglass Herring Fishery, Decrease in—Steam Trawlers within three-mile limit, etc.
Qs. Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 25*, 917.

Army Questions
Lancers — Reserve at Ballincollig, want of Equipment, alleged
Q. Lord W. de Eresby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1325.
Recruits for Army and Militia—Proportion Enlisted in Ireland
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 902.
Reserve Squadrons—Pay of Quartermasters and Adjutants
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1125.

Bills relating to Ireland, *see* their titles.

Carlingford Lough Lighthouse—Expenses, etc.
Q. Mr. Blakiston-Houston; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1137.
(*see also* sub-heading Strangford Lough.)

Church Fund, *see* title Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill.

Clare Co.—Delay in fixing Fair Rents
Q. Mr. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 18*, 296.

Clones Level Crossing and Platform—Report of Inspector.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 25*, 913.

Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see* that title.

Cootehill Postmastership — Applications and Appointment
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 914.

County Councils' Secretaries, Qualification, etc.—Mayo, Resignation of Mr. D. O'Connor Kelly, Delay in appointing Substitute, Expenses to be borne by Local Government Board or Ratepayers, etc.
Os. Earl of Arran, Earl of Denbigh, *June 26*, 1067.

County Officers and Courts Act—Account of Receipts and Payments Presented, *June 21*, 576, 613.

County Treasurers' Fee Fund—Account Presented, *June 26*, 1030.

Criminal Statistics Presented, *June 20*, 515; *June 21*, 575.

District Councillors—Labourers purchasing Holdings under Labourers Acts, Disqualification
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 918.

Dogs Regulation Act, 1865—Accounts of Receipts and Expenditure Presented, *June 18*, 258, 275.

Ireland—*cont.*

Downpatrick—Pretoria Relief Celebrations—Action of the Police, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 915.

Drunkenness, Number of Arrests for, etc.—Return Ordered, *June 25*, 896.

Dublin, *see* that title.

Education—*for* collective heading, *see* Education.

Evictions — *for* collective heading, *see* Evictions.

Fines, etc.—Abstract of Accounts Presented, *June 18*, 258, 276.

Fisheries
Annual Report Presented, *June 19*, 432; *June 21*, 575.
Ardglass Herring Fishery, and Kerry Mackerel Fisheries, *see* those sub-headings.

Gill, Mr., *see* sub-heading Agriculture and Technical Instruction Board.

Gold Ornaments in British Museum, *see* British Museum.

Great Northern Railway—Preferential Rates
Q. Mr. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1136.

Greystones — Removal of Gravel from Foreshore
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 28*, 1335.

Intermediate Education, *see* Education—Irish Questions.

Judicial Statistics — Return Presented, *June 20*, 515; *June 21*, 575.

Kerry Mackerel Fisheries—Destruction of Nets by Steam Trawlers, etc.
Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 25*, 918; *June 28*, 1349.

Killarney Land Commission—Number of Appeal Cases, Date of Sitting, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 26*, 1137.

Kilrush and Foynes Boat Communication
Q. Mr. O'Keeffe; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1346.

Land Commission—*for* collective heading, *see* Land Commission.

Land Purchase, *see* Land Commission.

Lansdowne's, Marquess of, Estate—Number of Ejectment Decrees granted
Q. Mr. T. J. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1345.

Licence Transfer, *see* sub-heading Rockcorry.

Local Fund Board—Annual Report Presented, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 256.

Lord Lieutenant, Aides-de-Camp to—Regimental Training
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1325.

Ireland—*cont.*
National School Teachers, *see* that title.

Nationalists and the Government, *see* subheading Agriculture and Technical Instruction Board—Appointment of Mr. Gill.

New Quay Water Supply, Condition of
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 916.

Pawnbrokers—Return from City Marshal of Dublin Presented, *June 14*, 7 ; *June 18*, 258.

Poor-Rate Collectors in Ulster—Refusal to accept part payment of Rates
Q. Mr. Archdale ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1343.

Quit Rents—Application of for the Relief of Local Taxation, proposed
Q. Mr. O'Keeffe ; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *June 28*, 1336.

Rate Books—Omission of Names of Owners and Lessees
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 18*, 295 ; *June 28*, 1345.

Representative Peers for Ireland, *see* that title.

Rockcorry Petty Sessions—Granting Licence Transfer to Land Agent and Acting Magistrate
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1344.

Roman Catholic University—Petitions, *June 14*, 4 ; *June 15*, 134 ; *June 18*, 272 ; *June 20*, 506 ; *June 22*, 770 ; *June 25*, 892.

Science College, Dublin—Date of Commencement of New Buildings
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 18*, 295.

Science Teachers attending Summer Classes—Facilities and Fees, etc.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 28*, 1350.

Strangford Lough Lighthouse—Refusal of Irish Lights Commission to provide Light, etc.
Q. Mr. H. C. Richards ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 14*, 16 ; *Q.* Mr. Blakiston-Houston ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1136.

Tithe Rent-charge, *see* that title.

Trawling, *see* that title.

Youthful Offenders Bill—Admission of Irish Children to English and Scotch Reformatories
Q. Mr. W. Johnston ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 25*, 914.

Isle of Man
Customs (Isle of Man) Bill, *see* that title.

Teachers' Superannuation—Legislation
Q. Mr. Yoxall ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 21*, 630.

Italy
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254, 256.

Jamaica
Fruit and Mail Steamship Service—Grant in aid
Q. Sir J. Fergusson ; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 28*, 1333.

Railway Debentures and the Income Tax —Additional Income Tax deducted from Dividends matured before Jan. 24
Os. Mr. Bartley, Sir M. H. Beach, *June 22*, 795, 796, 797.

Rum, Excise Restrictions on—Omission of Reports in Return, etc.
Q. Mr. Lawrence ; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 908.

James of Hereford, Lord
Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill, *Com.*, *June 19*, 415.

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1274.

Jameson Raid Indemnity
Great Britain's Claim by Right of Conquest
Q. Sir B. Gurdon ; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 142.

Japan
Anti-Foreign Rising in China --Co-operation of Japan with other Foreign Powers, *see* China, Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.

Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill
c. *Con.** *June 14*, 2.
3R.* *June 18*, 268.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Java
Trade Reports Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Jebb, Sir R. C. [Cambridge University]
Burial Grounds Bill, *Con.*, *June 18*, 399.

Education—Code and Minute of 1900, Age limit for Higher Elementary Schools, etc., *June 14*, 87.

Jeffreys, Mr. A. F. [Hants, N.]
Aldershot
General in Command, Date of Appointment, etc., *June 21*, 623.
Government Railway Siding—Erection of Roof, *June 25*, 902.
Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, etc., *June 18*, 282.

Army
Forage, Inspection of, etc., *June 19*, 473, 479.
Horses, Supply of Remounts, Subsidising Farmers, etc., *June 19*, 471.
Meat—System of passing in Camps, etc., *June 19*, 472.

Jeffreys, Mr. A. F.—*cont.*
- Oldham Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1106.
- Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 558.

Jessel, Capt. H. M. [St. Pancras, S.]
- Barracks—Cubicles, Lighting of Barrack Rooms, etc., *June 19*, 499.
- Regent's Park Inclosures, *June 22*, 850, 855.
- St. Pancras Lunacy Scandal, *June 22*, 837.

Johnston, Mr. W. [Belfast, S.]
- Ardglass Herring Fishery—Illegal Trawling, etc., *June 25*, 917.
- Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 519.
- Downpatrick Pretoria Relief Celebrations, *June 25*, 915.
- *Parliamentary Debates*, Reporting, etc., *June 22*, 845.
- Youthful Offenders Bill—Admission of Irish Children to English and Scotch Reformatories, etc., *June 25*, 914.

Johnstone, Mr. [Sussex, Horsham]
- Midwives Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1261.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvon, Arfon]
- Education—Code for 1900, Supply of Teachers, Training of Teachers, etc., *June 14*, 36.
- Record Office—Welsh-speaking Official, etc., *June 22*, 839.

Journals of the House
- Report from Committee—General Index Presented, *June 26*, 1030.

Judicial Statistics
- Ireland—Return Presented, *June 20*, 515; *June 21*, 575.

Jurors' Payment Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *June 18*, 408.

Jute Factories
- Regulations — Prosecution of Messrs. Ritchie
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1133.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
- Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, Discussions on Motions of Urgency, Patriotic Fund, etc., *June 18*, 315.
- Food Adulteration—Standards of Milk and Butter, *June 22*, 819.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 930.
- War Relief Fund Committee
  - Recommendations, *June 28*, 1319.
  - Report—Opportunity for Discussion, *June 15*, 280.

Kelly, Mr. D. O'Connor
- Secretary to Mayo County Council, Mismanagement, etc.
  - *Os.* Earl of Arran, Earl of Denbigh, *June 26*, 1067.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. [Devon, Honiton]
- Invalided Soldiers incapable of Earning Livelihood, Provision for, etc., *June 18*, 280.
- Military Manœuvres—Adoption of Helmet, *June 15*, 147.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. [Shropshire, Newport]
- Army Horses—Supply of Remounts, etc., *June 19*, 467.
- Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 522.
- Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, 3R., *June 27*, 1224, 1225.

Kerry
- Mackerel Fisheries—Destruction of Nets by Steam Trawlers, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 25*, 918; *June 28*, 1349.

Kew
- National Physical Laboratory, Erection of, in Old Deer Park
  - *Os.* Lord Balcarres, Mr. Hanbury, *June 15*, 192.

Killarney
- Land Commission—Number of Appeal Cases, Date of Sittings, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 26*, 1137.

Killylea National School
- Result Fees—Payment of Arrears
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 21*, 635.

Kilmainham Hospital
- Vote for, *June 22*, 871.

Kilrush
- Foynes and Kilrush, Steamer Communication between, Establishment of
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Keeffe; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1346.

Kimberley, Earl of
- China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc., *June 18*, 259; *June 28*, 1268.
- Cromwell Statue, Erection within the Precincts of Palace of Westminster without the consent of Parliament, *June 21*, 597.
- Lunacy Administration — St. Pancras Scandal, *June 26*, 1065.
- Marriage Act Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 264; *June 26*, 1055, 1056.
- Military Lands Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 581, 582; *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1291, 1296.
- Secondary Education Bill, Intro., *June 26*, 1043.
- Uganda Railway Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 586, 588.
- Union of Benefices Act, 1860, Amendment Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 882, 883.
- Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 578; *Re-com.*, *June 28*, 1283.

[*cont.*

King, Sergeant J.
Dismissal from Wiltshire Volunteers
Qs. Lord E. Fitzmaurice, Dr. Farquharson: *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 617.

Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill
*c. Con.** and 3R.* *June 18*, 270.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Kirklands Asylum
Rules for Government Presented, *June 28*, 1267.

Kloptsch, Dr.
Indian Famine Report
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 15*, 154.

Knowles, Mr. L. [Salford, W.]
Volunteer Camps—Officers' Command Pay, *June 21*, 618.

Krupp, Messrs.
Turkish Fleet, Re-construction of—Contract given to German firm, in consequence of Political pressure
Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 21*, 626.

Kumassi
See Ashanti—Coomassie.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]
Aldershot Heat Casualties—Authority Responsible for, etc., *June 19*, 490.
Schools—Erecting by Limited Liability Companies, etc., *June 15*, 175.

Labour
Children, Employment of—Casual Employment for Wages, Legislation proposed
Q. Mr. Drage; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 25*, 912.

Labourers Act, Ireland
District Councillors — Labourers purchasing Holdings, Disqualification
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 918.
Schedules—Names of Lessees and Owners omitted from Rate Books
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 18*, 295.

Ladysmith
see South African War.

Lafone, Mr. A. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Ladysmith, Siege of, Publication of Sir G. White's Despatches, *June 15*, 141.

Lambeth Water Bill
c. 3R* *June 15*, 130.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Lamington, Lord
Australian Commonwealth Bill—Objections to Governor's Intervention
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 908.

Lancashire, Derbyshire and East Coast Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *June 18*, 251.
*Rep.** *June 26*, 1026.

Lancashire Inebriates Acts Board Bill
c. 3R.* *June 18*, 269.
l. Commons Amendts., *June 19*, 412.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill
*l. Rep.** *June 25*, 875.

Lancaster Corporation Bill
*c. Con.** and 3R.* *June 19*, 421.
l. 1R.* *June 19*, 411.
2R.* *June 26*, 1025.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 874.

Lancaster, County Palatine of
Polling District—Division, County Council Order Presented, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 258.

Lancaster, Duchy of
Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Lord James of Hereford.

Lancers
Reserve Regiment at Ballincollig—Want of Equipment, alleged
Q. Lord Willoughby de Eresby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1325.

Land Charges Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *June 18*, 387, 390.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 19*, 416.

Land Charges Bill
Debate on
Consideration as Amended by the Standing Committee and Third Reading, *June 18*, 387.
Consolidation of Law, 387, 390.
Judgments Act of 1838, 387.
Lites pendens, Registration, etc., of, 388, 389.
Registrar of Judgments
Abolition of Office, Transfer of Business to Land Registry, etc., 388, 389.
Scotch and Irish Judgments not affected by Abolition of Office, 389.

Land Commission, Ireland
Clare, County — Delay in fixing Fair Rents
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 18*, 296.
Congested Districts Board Act—Rules Presented, *June 14*, 7 ; *June 18*, 256.
Expenses—Return
Motion (Earl of Mayo), *June 26*, 1058.
Killarney—Number of Appeal Cases, Date of Sittings, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 26*, 1137.
Proceedings
Return Presented, *June 14*, 7 ; *June 18*, 256.
Rules Presented, *June 14*, 7 ; *June 18*, 256.
Purchase of Land
Allen's, A., Holding — Sale of, at Irvinestown
Qs. Mr. Murnaghan ; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 22*, 789 ; *June 28*, 1343.
Tenant Purchases under Section 40 of Land Act, etc.
Q. Mr. Morris ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 26*, 1138.
Tithe Rent-charge, *see* that title.

Land Registry (New Buildings) Bill
c. *Com.* Rep.** and 3R.* *June 18*, 401.
l. 1R.* *June 19*, 416.
2R.* *June 28*, 1269.
Petition, *June 22*, 770.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1025.

Land Revenues of the Crown
Quit Rents, Ireland, *see* that title.
(*see also* title Woods, Forests, etc.)

Land Revenue Record Office
Public Inspection of Records
Q. Mr. Woods ; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *June 19*, 446.

Land Values Taxation (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 133 ; *June 21*, 607.

Land Warfare
Naval Forces in Land Warfare, *see* Naval Forces.

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act (1854) Amendment Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 133 ; *June 21*, 607.

Lansdowne Marquess of—*Secretary of State for War*
Military Lands Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 578, 579, 580, 582, 583 ; *June 25*, 883, 884 ; *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1287, 1292, 1294, 1295.
Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *June 22*, 741.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 577 ; *Re-com.*, *June 28*, 1281, 1284.

Lansdowne's, Marquess of, Estate
Evictions—Number of Ejectment Decrees granted
Q. Mr. T. J. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1345.

Larceny Act (1861) Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *June 22*, 795.

Latimer Road and Acton Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *June 19*, 410.
Rep. June 25*, 875.

Laurie, Gen. J. W. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]
Army
Horses—Purchase in Canada, etc., *June 19*, 468.
Meat Rations, etc., *June 19*, 479.
Militia and Army Commissions—Competitive Examinations, *June 19*, 437.
Cadet Corps—Formation of Special Department proposed, *June 26*, 1124.
South African War
Boer Prisoners at St. Helena—Presents, *June 25*, 897.
Field Service Equipment, Loss of—Compensation, *June 19*, 433,

Law Society
see Incorporated Law Society.

Lawrence, Mr. W. F. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
Education—Liverpool Schools and the Block Grant, *June 15*, 178.
Jamaica Rum, Excise Restrictions on—Omission of Reports in Return, *June 25*, 908.

Lawson, Mr. J. G. [York, N.R., Thirsk]
Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 519.
Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth Schools Bill), 3R., *June 22*, 752, 753.
Charity Commissioners—Sale of Charity Lands in 1899, *June 22*, 228 ; *June 26*, 1134.
Food Stuffs—Importation of Fraudulent Food Stuffs, *June 22*, 817.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 977.
Oldham Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1099, 1106.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill, *Com.*, *June 20*, 570.
Tydd St. Mary Charity, *June 22*, 828.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 532, 544 ; 3R., *June 27*, 1213.

Lawson, Sir W. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
Duke of Edinburgh's Volunteer Rifles—Mr. Logan's Gift of Maxim Gun and alleged Message, *June 25*, 899.

Lea, Sir T. [Londonderry, S.]
National School Teachers, Ireland—Examination for Promotion, *June 25*, 915.

Lead Poisoning
Address for Return, *June 22*, 775 ; Return Presented *June 26*, 1114.
Number of Cases, Temporary and Permanent, Suspensions, etc.—Returns
Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 21*, 629.

Lecky, Rt. Hon. W. E. H. [Dublin University]
Irish Gold Ornaments in British Museum, transferring to Ireland, *June 15*, 188.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1415.

Lee Conservancy Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 18*, 253 ; *June 25*, 876.

Leek Post Office
Insufficient Accommodation
Q. Mr. Bill ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 911.

Leighton, Mr. S. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Irish Gold Ornaments in British Museum, Transferring to Ireland, *June 15*, 186.
Legal Proceedings against Museum Trustees, etc., *June 22*, 792.
Treasure Trove—Treasury Minutes since 1837, etc., Laying on the Table, *June 21*, 635 ; *June 22*, 792.

Leith Burgh Provisional Order Bill
*c. Con.** *June 14*, 3.
3R.* *June 15*, 131.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 18*, 252.

Leng, Sir J. [Dundee]
Dundee University College—Grant-in-aid, *June 15*, 200.
South African War
Christmas Presents—Non-delivery of, *June 19*, 435.
Invalided Soldiers incapable of earning a Livelihood, Provision for—Extension of Powers of Chelsea Commissioners, *June 18*, 280.
Underground Telegraph Wires, London to Birmingham Experiment—Extension to the North proposed, *June 18*, 293.

Letters
Night Mails for the Provinces, Earlier hours of posting etc., *see* Post Office—Transfer of Work from General Office to Mount Pleasant, etc.

Level Crossings
Clones—Report of Inspector
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 25*, 913.

Lewis, Mr. J. H. [Flint Boroughs]
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, Peking Legations, Safety of, *June 19*, 443 ; *June 21*, 628 ; *June 22*, 781.
Education
Higher Grade Schools—Training of Teachers, etc., *June 15*, 173.
Report—Date of Issue, *June 22*, 788.
Teachers, Training Colleges, etc., *June 15*, 160.
Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 678.
Great Indian Peninsula Railway Bill—Annuities, *Com.*, *June 19*, 420.
India—Judicial and Executive Functions, Separation of, Memorial, *June 28*, 1333.
Record Office—Appointment of Welsh-speaking Official, *June 22*, 840.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1398, 1401.
Wales
Census—Papers containing Language Column, *June 22*, 840.
Foreshores—Leases, etc., *June 22*, 863.
Museum Grants for Wales, *June 15*, 160.
North Wales Lunatic Asylum—Purchase of Mineral Rights, Excessive Charge, etc., *June 22*, 846, 862.
Re-afforesting, *June 22*, 847.

Libraries
Public Libraries Bill, *see* that title.

Licensed Premises (Hours of Sale) (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *June 20*, 505 ; *June 21*, 607 ; *June 27*, 1206.

Licensing
see Liquor Traffic.

Licensing Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 133 ; *June 21*, 607 ; *June 27*, 1206.

Lighthouses
Ireland
Strangford Lough and Carlingford Lighthouses, etc.
Q. Mr. Blakiston-Houston ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1136.
Refusal of Irish Lights Commission to provide Light
Q. Mr. H. C. Richards ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 14*, 16.

Lights on Vehicles
Side Lights on Covered Vans—Regulations
Q. Gen. Russell ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 18*, 292.

Lincoln Corporation Tramways Bill
*c. Rep.** *June 25*, 891.

Lindley
see South African War.

Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws
Drunkenness in Ireland — Number of Arrests, etc. Return Ordered, *June 25*, 896.

[*cont.*

Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws —*cont.*

Licensing (Sale of Intoxicating Liquors), Petitions for Alteration of Law, *June 15*, 133; *June 25*, 892.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquor on Sunday Bill and Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill, *see* those titles.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bills, *see* their titles.

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill, *see* that title.

Transfer of Licences in Ireland, Licence granted to Land Agent and Magistrate
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1344.

Liverpool

Census Returns, Alleged Inaccuracy—Report of Medical Officer
Q. Sir J. Willox; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *June 21*, 633.

Education, Effect of Block Grant on Liverpool Schools
Os. Mr. D. MacIver, *June 14*, 76; Mr. Lawrence, Sir J. Gorst, *June 15*, 178.

Postal Staff
Inspectors of Telegraph Messengers Performing Duties of Telegraphists
Q. Mr. T. P. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 28*, 1341.

Number of Temporary Sorting Clerks and Telegraphists, etc.
Q. Mr. T. P. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 28*, 1340.

Liverpool Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 19*, 410.

Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *June 18*, 251.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 425.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 888.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon, etc.]

Charity Commissioners—Tydd St. Mary Scheme, etc., *June 22*, 830.

Education
Dismissal of Teachers, Audit of Accounts of Voluntary Schools, etc., *June 15*, 164.

Religious Instruction, Nonconformist Grievances, etc., *June 14*, 113.

Gold Coast Colony—Concessions Ordinance, *June 25*, 909.

North Wales Asylum—Purchase of Mineral Rights, etc., *June 22*, 860.

Re-afforestation of Wales, *June 22*, 861.

Loans

Loans Raised in India, Return Presented, *June 19*, 412, 431.

Money-lending Bill, see that title.

Public Works Loan Commission, Vote for, *June 22*, 840.

Local Authorities Officers' Superannuation Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 4; *June 18*, 272; *June 21*, 608; *June 22*, 770.

Local Fund Board
Ireland—Annual Report Presented, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 256.

Local Government Act, 1888
County and County Borough Councils—Orders Presented, *June 14*, 8.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. H. Chaplin.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. T. W. Russell.

Assistant Laboratory Clerk, Appointment and Salary — Senior Assistant Clerks' Grievance
Q. Mr. Yoxall; A. Mr. Chaplin; *June 28*, 1340.

St. Pancras Lunacy Scandal
Debate (Lords), *June 26*, 1059.

Local Government (Ireland) Bill
c. Intro. and 1R.* *June 21*, 637.

Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
c. Intro. and 1R.* *June 21*, 637.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 26*, 1028.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 21*, 574.
*Com.** *June 25*, 877.
*Rep.** *June 26*, 1028.
3R.* *June 28*, 1266.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 21*, 574.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *June 25*, 877.
3R.* *June 26*, 1028.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 250.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 21*, 574.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *June 25*, 877.
3R.* *June 26*, 1028.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 250.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
c. *Rep.** and 3R.* *June 21*, 606.
l. 1R.* *June 21*, 574.
2R.* *June 26*, 1029.
Com., *June 28*, 1265.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 874.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 22*, 767.
*Con.** and 3R.* *June 25*, 890.
l. 1R.* *June 25*, 877.
2R.* *June 26*, 1029.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1025.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
c. Rep. June 22*, 767.
*Con.** and 3r.* *June 25*, 890.
l. 1r.* *June 25*, 877.
2r.* *June 26*, 1029.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1025.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 18*, 270.
Standing Orders, *June 15*, 130.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 18*, 270.
Standing Orders, *June 15*, 130.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 18*, 270.
Rep. June 25*, 891.
3r.* *June 26*, 1109.
l. 1r.* *June 28*, 1267.
Standing Orders, *June 15*, 130.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 19*, 422.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 268.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 19*, 422.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 268.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 19*, 422.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 268.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 19*, 422.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 268.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill
c. Con. June 14*, 3.
3r.* *June 15*, 131.
l. 1r.* *June 18*, 253.
2r.* *June 26*, 1029.
Com. June 28*, 1266.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 874.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of the Working Classes) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 18*, 270.
Rep. June 25*, 891.
3r.* *June 26*, 1109.
l. 1r.* *June 28*, 1267.
Standing Orders, *June 15*, 130.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) (No. 1) Bill
l. 2r.* *June 21*, 574.
*Com.** and *Rep.* June 25*, 877.
3r.* *June 26*, 1028.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
l. 2r.* *June 21*, 574.
Com. June 25*, 877.
Rep. June 26*, 1028.
3r.* *June 28*, 1266.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) (No. 3) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 19*, 422.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 268.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) (No. 4) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 19*, 422.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 268.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (Ireland) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 18*, 270.
Rep. June 25*, 890.
3r * *June 26*, 1109.
l. 1r.* *June 28*, 1267.
Standing Orders, *June 15*, 130.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
c. 2r.* *June 19*, 422.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 268.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill
c. Rep. June 22*, 767.
3r.* *June 25*, 890.
l. 1r.* *June 25*, 877.
2r.* *June 26*, 1029.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1025.

Local Government Provisional Order Bills
Distinctive Titles, suggested
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 19*, 416.

Local Government (Scotland) Bills
Petitions, *June 14*, 4 ; *June 15*, 133 ; *June 19*, 426 ; *June 21*, 608 ; *June 25*, 892 ; *June 27*, 1206.

Local Taxation
Government Property, *see* that title.

Hospitals (Exemption from Rates)—Leave given to Witness to attend Select Committee, *June 26*, 1030, 1139 ; *June 28*, 1354.

Licence Duties and Penalties, Amounts Received—Return Ordered, *June 15*, 138.

Rating of Woodlands—Petition, *June 21*, 608.

Royal Commission—Minutes of Evidence Presented, *June 14*, 7 ; *June 18*, 255.

Local Taxation Account
Return Ordered, *June 21*, 615.

Loch Fyne
Illegal Fishing, Suppression of — Inadequacy of Cutter "Daisy"
Q. Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 25*, 913.

Lockwood, Col. [Essex, Epping]
Hospital Arrangements at Bloemfontein—Mr. Burdett-Coutts' Charges, etc., *June 28*, 1314.

Logan, Mr. [Member of Cape Parliament]
Duke of Edinburgh's Volunteer Rifles—Gift of Maxim Gun, etc.
Q. Sir W. Lawson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 899.

London Borough Councils (Women's Disabilities Removal) Bill
Petitions *June 14*, 4; *June 22*, 770.

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill
c. 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
*Rep.** *June 22*, 767.
*Con.** *June 25*, 890.

London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *June 28*, 1303.
Boundary Street Scheme, 1304, 1307.
Re-housing—Providing accommodation before demolishing old buildings, 1303, 1305, 1307.

London County Council
Estimate of Expenditure, etc.—Return Presented, *June 15*, 138; *June 18*, 257.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 25*, 876.

London County Council (Improvements) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 22*, 738.
Standing Orders, *June 19*, 409.

London County Council (Money) Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 22*, 767.

London County Council (Spitalfields Market) Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 25*, 876.

London County Tramways (No. 1) Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 26*, 1109.

London Docks
Royal Commission of Inquiry—Constitution and Terms of Reference
Q. Mr. A. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 22*, 787.

London School Board
Number of Recognised School Places, Number of Children to be Provided for, etc.
Q. Lord H. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 26*, 1135.

London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill
c. 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
*Rep.** *June 22*, 767.
*Con.** *June 25*, 890.

London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill
c. 1R.* *June 15*, 131.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 889.

London (St. Marylebone) Provisional Order Bill
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 422.

London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill
c. 1R.* *June 15*, 132.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 889.

London, Walthamstow and Epping Forest Railway Act 1894
Delay in Completion of Railway—Abandonment Bills
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 14*, 14.

London, Walthamstow and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Bill
c. Ordered, *June 26*, 1108.
1R.* *June 27*, 1205.
Standing Orders, *June 15*, 129; *June 26*, 1110.

London United Tramways Bill
l. 2R.* *June 25*, 875.

London University
Vote for, *June 15*, 211.

London and North Western Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *June 25*, 875.

London and North Western Railway (Wales) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 25*, 875.
Standing Orders, *June 21*, 573.

London and St. Katherine Docks and East and West India Dock Companies Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 14*, 3.
*Com.** and 3R.* *June 18*, 270.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

London and San Francisco Bank Bill
l. Rep. June 25*, 875.

London and South Western Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *June 19*, 411.
Report of Attorney General Presented, *June 18*, 250.

Londesborough, Earl of
Sat First in Parliament after the death of his Father, *June 25*, 874.

Londonderry, Marquess of—*Postmaster General*
Post Office—Transfer to Mount Pleasant —Postal Arrangements, Delays, etc. *June 21*, 598.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*President of the Board of Agriculture* [Liverpool, West Derby]
Adulteration of Food—Administration of the Food and Drugs Act, etc., *June 22*, 819.
Cattle Diseases — Destruction of Pens, *June 22*, 820.
Dairy Produce—Presumptive Standards of Quality, *June 22*, 819; *June 28*, 1338.
Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreaks
Restrictions on Movement of Cattle—Question of Compensation, etc., *June 22*, 812, 817.
Milk Trade and the Barn Gallon, *June 22*, 818.
Swine Fever—Progress in Stamping out, etc., *June 22*, 811.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 529, 551, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid]
Killylea National School Teachers—Arrears of Result Fees, *June 21*, 635.

Lord Advocate
Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.

Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Chief Justice of England
Lord Russell of Killowen.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl Cadogan.
Aides-de-camp, Regimental Training
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1325.

Lord Privy Seal
Viscount Cross.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 931, 971, 1002, 1003, 1008.

Lowe, Mr. F. W. [Birmingham, Edgbaston]
Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill, 3R, *June 22*, 754.
Militia, Adjutants' and Quartermasters' Training Allowances—Additional Grant-in-aid, *June 18*, 285.

Lowles, Mr. J. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 986.

Lowther Rt. Hon. J. [Kent, Thanet]
Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 516, 617, 618, 621, 622.
Blocking Notices—Hospital Arrangements in South Africa, *June 28*, 1312.
Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, Raising Questions of Urgency, etc., *June 18*, 301.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, 3R., *June 27*, 1215.

Lowther Rt. Hon. J. W.—*Chairman of Committees* [Cumberland, Penrith]
Amendments to Bills
Amendments disposed of by decision arrived at by the Committee, *June 25*, 960, 961, 991, 997.
Amendments raising same point, *June 25*, 950.
New Clause in place of Amendment, *June 25*, 947.
Unnecessary Amendment, *June 25*, 947.
Irrelevant Observations, *June 18*, 369; *June 25*, 931.
Objections to Bills — Objections should have taken place on Second Reading, *June 19*, 420.
Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill, Order Referring Bill to Special Committee, *June 21*, 603.
Supply
Discussing Legislation Prospects, *June 14*, 45.

[*cont.*

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*cont.*
  Supply—*cont.*
    Discussing subjects which should be raised on other Votes, *June 19*, 451, 452 ; *June 22*, 796, 797.
    Education Vote and Religious Views of Members of School Boards, *June 14*, 56.
    Raising a Debate on a subject on which a Division had been taken, *June 15*, 162, 163.

Loyd, Mr. A. K. [Berks, Abingdon]
  Milk Trade—Use of Barn Gallon, etc., *June 22*, 816.
  Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 560.

Lubbock, Sir J.
  see Avebury, Lord.

Luggage
  Excess Charges
    Amount of free luggage allowed, etc.—Displaying in Stations
      Q. Sir C. Gull ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 18*, 290.
    Powers of the Board of Trade to regulate Charges
      Q. Mr. Trevelyan ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 18*, 289.
    South Eastern and Chatham Railway Charges
      Q. Sir C. Gull ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 18*, 290.

Lunacy
  Administration
    Debate (Lords), *June 26*, 1059.
    Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 835.
    St. Pancras Scandal, *see* that title.
  Scotland—Rules for Government of Kirklands Asylum Presented, *June 28*, 1267, 1312.

Lunacy Bill
  Petitions, *June 14*, 4 ; *June 15*, 133 ; *June 18*, 272 ; *June 19*, 426 ; *June 20*, 505 ; *June 21*, 608 ; *June 25*, 892.

Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill
  Petitions, *June 15*, 133.

Lunacy Commission, England
  Vote for, *June 22*, 833—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Lunacy Regulation (Ireland) Bill
  l. Rep. June 26*, 1031 ; *June 28*, 1279.

Lunatics
  St. Pancras Scandal
    Debate (Lords), *June 26*, 1059.

Lyell, Sir L. [Orkney and Shetland]
  Channel Fleet, Visit to Shetland proposed, *June 18*, 285.

Lyttelton, Mr. A. [Warwick and Leamington]
  Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 727.

Macaleese, Mr. D. [Monaghan, N.]
  Clones Level Crossing and Platform—Inspector's Report, *June 25*, 913.
  Rockcorry Petty Sessions — Granting Licence Transfer to Acting Magistrate, *June 28*, 1344.

Macartney, Mr. W. E.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Antrim, S.]
  China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc., British Forces on Shore, Strength and Composition, *June 22*, 782.
  Deptford Victualling Yard — Overtime Records, Inaccurate System, *June 26*, 1128.
  Horses for South Africa—Cost of Transport, *June 25*, 898.
  Recruiting in the Highlands—Training Ship at Portree, proposed, *June 25*, 913.
  Volunteer Camps—Dockyard Employees in Devonshire Regiment, Pay, etc., *June 25*, 902.

Macedonia
  Northern Macedonia—Increase of British Consular Staff, proposed
    Q. Mr. Stevenson ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 28*, 1334.

MacIver, Mr. D. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
  Education—Effect of Code on Liverpool Schools, etc., *June 14*, 76.

Maclean, Mr. J. M. [Cardiff]
  Afghanistan, Ameer's Refusal to allow Export of Horses to and Import of Salt from India — Indian Government Control, *June 21*, 625.
  Cardiff Treasure Trove, *June 19*, 448.
  China—Anti-Foreign Rising
    Concert of the Powers—Relations between Great Britain and Russia, *June 14*, 14.
    Warning of Rising, *June 26*, 1122.
  Commonwealth of Australia Bill
    Com. June 18, 368 ; *June 21*, 645, 657.
    Intervention of Colonial Governors, *June 25*, 908.

[*cont.*

Maclean, Mr. J. M.—*cont.*
- India
  - Army
    - British and Native Troops, Total Number withdrawn for Service outside India, etc., *June 21*, 626.
    - Troops withdrawn from Establishment for Service outside India, English Officers with Native Regiments, etc., *June 26*, 1122.
  - Budget—Date of Introduction, *June 21*, 626.
  - Famine—Relief Organisation—Camp System of Distribution, etc., *June 19*, 440, 441.
- Money-lending Bill, 2R. *June 21*, 698.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
- Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, Food Rations, etc., *June 28*, 1324.
- Greenock Board School—Providing Prizes out of School Fund, *June 28*, 1343.
- South African War
  - British Prisoners, Release of—Court of Inquiry into circumstances leading to Surrender, *June 28*, 1320.
  - Roodeval Engagement—Capture of Derbyshire Militia, *June 28*, 1321.
  - Transvaal, Return of Miners, etc.—Sir A. Milner's Warning, *June 28*, 1323.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool Exchange]
- Bootle and New Brighton Ferry and the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, *June 25*, 887.
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1165.
- Merchant Shipping (Liabilities of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1226, 1229, 1230, 1231, 1237, 1242, 1247, 1248, 1254.
- Telegrams, Code and Cypher Commercial Telegrams to South Afria—Removal of Restrictions, *June 19*, 436.

M'Iver, Sir L. [Edinburgh, W.]
- Rangoon Outrage by British Soldiers, *June 22*, 784.

M'Kenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
- Enteric Fever, Inoculation against, in South Africa—Statistics, *June 26*, 1116.
- Oldham Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1103.
- Reservists' Pensions—Counting Service in Sections A, B, C, etc., *June 22*, 777.
- Workmen's Compensation Act
  - Bailey *v.* Plant, *June 26*, 1133.
  - Extension to Naval and Military Servants, *June 18*, 279.

Machynlleth Rifle Range
- Completion of
  - *Q.* Col. Pryce-Jones; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 624.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Sheffield, Brightside]
- Brecon Goods yard, Fatality in—Board of Trade Inquiry, *June 14*, 15.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 928, 1015.
- Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 731.
- Post Office—Transfer of work from General Post Office to Mount Pleasant, Delay in Delivery of letters, *June 21*, 634.

Madras
- Land Revenue—Correspondence Regarding Sale of Defaulters' Lands, Return Ordered, *June 26*, 1114.

Mafeking, Siege of
- Fenians under Arrest, *see* South African War—Martial Law.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace
- Rockcorry Petty Sessions — Granting Transfer of Licence to Land Agent and Acting Magistrate
  - *Q.* Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1344.
- Small Tenants—Summary Powers of Evictions—Communication to London Magistrates
  - *Q.* Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 28*, 1337.

Maidenhead Gas Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *June 18*, 251.
  - Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Maidstone Gaol
- Warder Searle's Pension—Increase of, proposed
  - *Q.* Mr. Cornwallis; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1132.

Mails
- Australian Mail Steamers—Fremantle as Port of Call
  - *Q.* Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.
- Jamaica — Grant-in-aid for Steamship Service
  - *Q.* Sir J. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 28*, 1333.
- St. Helena—Delay in forwarding English Mails from Cape Town
  - *Q.* Mr. Bill; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 897.
- Transfer of Post Office to Mount Pleasant, Earlier Posting of Provincial Mails, Delays, etc., *see* Post Office.

Malta
- Contagious Diseases Law—Copy of Ordinance Presented, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 254.
- Tunny Nets—Imposition of Special Tax
  - *Q.* Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 150.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee, *June 22*, 738.
  - 3R.* *June 28*, 1266.

Manchester Ship Canal Bill
- *c.* 3R.* *June 14*, 1.
- *l.* Commons Amendts., *June 18*, 252.
  - Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Manchester Ship Canal
- Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners, etc.) Bill, *see* that title.

Manchester Volunteers
- Salisbury Plain Manœuvres — Commissariat Breakdown
  - *Qs.* Mr. Holland, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 621.

Manners, Lord E. W. [Leicestershire, Melton]
- Soldiers' Headgear—Unsuitability of Forage Cap, etc., *June 19*, 481.

Manœuvres
- Naval Manœuvres, *see* Navy.
- Salisbury Plain Manœuvres, *see* Salisbury Plain.

Maple, Sir B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 931.

Margate Corporation Bill
- Standing Orders, *June 18*, 266.

Margate Pier and Harbour Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *June 15*, 131.

Marine Biological Association
- Grant-in-aid—Insufficiency of Grant, etc.
  - *Os.* Mr. Bowles, Mr. Hanbury, *June 15*, 190, 192.

Marine Pensioners
- Discharge of from Hospital — Case of Roberts
  - *Q.* Sir J. Baker; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1126.

Market Weighton Drainage and Navigation Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *June 21*, 574.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1170.
- Hospital Accommodation for Invalided Soldiers Returning from South Africa—Case of Private Mitchell, *June 21*, 616.
- Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1187.

Marriage
- Act of 1898 — Number of Registered Buildings, Number of Marriages, etc.—Return Ordered, *June 18*, 277.
- Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill, *see* that title.

Marriage Act Amendment Bill
- *l.* 2R., *June 18*, 259.
  - *Com.*, *June 26*, 1049.

Marriage Act Amendment Bill
- Debate on Second Reading and in Committee, *June 18*, 259; *June 26*, 1049.
  - Canal Boats and other Moveable Dwellings, Persons living on, 262.
  - Declaration as to Church in which the Marriage will be solemnised, etc., 1052, 1054, 1056.
  - False Statements punishable, 263.
  - Fees, 262.
  - Fictitious Residence, 1053, 1055.
  - Licence, Marriage by, 261.
  - Lord Hardwicke's Act, 261, 263.
  - Marriages to be solemnised in any Church in the Diocese wherein the Banns have been published, 260, 263, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1056.
  - Registry Office Marriages — Notices exhibited in such a way as to be passed unnoticed, etc., 1052, 1054.
  - Seamen's Marriages, 261, 262, 1057.
  - Statement of Particulars in Writing by Parties applying to have Banns published, 261.
  - Time for publishing Banns, 260.

Martial Law in South Africa
- *see* South African War.

Martin, Mr. R. B. [Worcester, Droitwich]
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1162.
- Swine Fever, Feeding of Pigs, etc., *June 22*, 805.

Mather, Mr. W. [Lancashire, Rossendale]
- Education
  - Code for 1900, Higher Grade Schools, etc., *June 14*, 83.
  - Teaching of Infants, etc., *June 14*, 83.

Matthews, Sir L.
- Slavery in Zanzibar, etc.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *June 15*, 217; Mr. J. A. Pease, 218.

Mauser Rifles
- South African War—Rifles taken from the Boers — Utilising for Rifle Clubs, etc., suggested
  - *O.* Capt. Norton, *June 19*, 494, 496.

Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E. [Wigton]
- Army Horses, Supply of Remounts, etc., *June 19*, 455.

Mayo
County Council Secretary — Case of Mr. D. O'Connor Kelly — Expenses arising out of Mismanagement and Delay in appointing substitute, etc.
Os. Earl of Arran, Earl of Denbigh, *June 26*, 1067.

Mayo, Earl of
Irish Land Commission —Return of Expenses, *June 26*, 1058.

Meat
Cattle, Meat and Produce Markets—Petition for Establishment in London, *June 14*, 3.

Meath, Earl of
Military Drill in Schools, etc., *June 28*, 1293.
Military Lands Bill, *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1293.

Medals
Boer War, 1881—Issue of Medals proposed
Q. Gen. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1322.
Deceased Officers' Medals, Forwarding to Relations—Case of Capt. Fenwick
Q. Gen. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 620.
South African War Medal Design
Os. Lord Balcarres, Sir M. H. Beach, *June 22*, 838.

Medical Arrangements in South Africa
see South African War.

Members of Parliament
Inter-Parliamentary Conference at Paris —Leave of Absence
Q. Mr. Pierpoint; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 793.

Menstone Water (Transfer) Bill
c. Con. June 14*, 2.
3R.* *June 18*, 269.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 19*, 412; *June 21*, 573.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Merchant Shipping
Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping Presented, *June 18*, 256, 274.
British Merchant Shipping — Tables showing Progress Presented, *June 19*, 431.
Certificates of Freeboard (Load Line) issued by Government of South Australia to Vessels registered in that Colony—Order in Council Presented, *June 18*, 257, 276.
China, British Shipping, *see* China.
Humber Pilotage Commissioners' Bye-laws —Order in Council Presented, *June 18*, 256, 276.
Jamaica Fruit and Mail Steamship Service —Grants-in-aid
Q. Sir J. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 28*, 1333.

Merchant Shipping—*cont.*
London Docks, Royal Commission on, *see* Docks.
United States—Shipping and Shipbuilding on the American Lakes—Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill
c. Con. and 3R., *June 27*, 1226, 1254.

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill
Debate on Consideration and Third Reading, *June 27*, 1226.
Cork, etc., Application of the Bill to, 1229, 1231, 1235, 1237, 1239, 1240. 1241, 1242, 1244, 1245, 1247, 1249, 1251.
Dockowners, Liability of, 1226, 1227, 1230, 1232, 1233, 1234, 1236, 1238, 1253, 1254.
Definition of Vessel "within" the Area over which the Dock Authorities Exercise Power, 1238, 1239, 1240, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1245, 1247, 1249.
Manchester Ship Canal, 1229, 1234, 1244, 1251.
Shipowners, Liability of, 1226, 1230, 1231, 1252, 1254.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill
c. Con. June 15, 129.
3R. *June 25*, 886.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 26*, 1028, *June 28*, 1265.

Mersey Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *June 25*, 890.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 266.

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Petersham) Provisional Order Bill
l. 2R.* *June 21*, 575.
*Com.** and *Rep.* June 22*, 740.
3R.* *June 25*, 877.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 250.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill
c. 3R.* *June 14*, 1.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737; *June 26*, 1025.

Metropolitan Water Supply
Royal Commission—Minutes of Evidence Presented, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 254.

Mexico
Trade Report [State of Sonora] Presented, *June 28*, 1267.

Mid-Kent Water Bill
c. Con. * *June 14*, 2.
3R.* *June 18*, 269.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
- Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 671.
- National Gallery, Danger from Fire—Proposed Isolation, *June 15*, 157.

Midland Railway
- Brecon Goods Yard, Fatality in—Board of Trade Inquiry
  - *Q.* Mr. Maddison; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 14*, 15.

Midland Railway Bill
- *l.* Report from Committee of Selection, *June 25*, 876.
- *c. Con.*, *June 27*, 1254.

Midwives Bill
- *c. Con.*, *June 27*, 1254.

Midwives Bill
- Debate on Consideration as amended, etc., *June 27*, 1254.
  - Fines for acts contrary to Certificate, 1256.
  - Infant Mortality, etc., 1255, 1258, 1259, 1260.
  - Local Control, Necessity for, 1256.
  - Registration, 1257, 1258, 1259, 1260, 1261.
- Granting special facilities for passing Bill this Session
  - *Q.* Mr. Egerton; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 920.
- Petitions, *June 15*, 134; *June 26*, 1111.

Milbank
- Erection of New Barracks
  - *Os.* Dr. Farquharson, Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 498, 500.

Milford Docks Bill
- *c. Rep.** *June 22*, 768.
  - 3R.* *June 26*, 1108.

Military Drill in Schools
- *O.* Earl of Meath, *June 28*, 1293.
- Cadet Corps, *see* that title.

Military Lands Bill
- *l. Com.*, *June 21*, 578.
  - *Rep.*, *June 26*, 1031; *June 28*, 1285.

Military Lands Bill
- Debate in Committee and Report of Amendments, *June 21*, 578; *June 28*, 1285.
  - Cadet Corps, Free Use of Rifle Ranges, 1293, 1294, 1295.
  - Compulsory Acquisition of Land, 1295, 1297.
  - Cost of Sites for Rifle Ranges, 1285, 1287, 1291, 1292.

Military Lands Bill—*cont.*
- Debate in Committee, etc.—*cont.*
  - "Legislation by Reference," Schedule instead of, 579, 580, 581, 582.
  - Local Authorities, Powers of, 1289, 1293.
  - Rates, charged on, etc., 1285, 1289, 1291.
  - Rifle Clubs, Removing Restrictions, 578.
  - Scotland, Application of Bill to, 583.
  - Volunteer Corps, Borrowing Powers, 579.

Military Manœuvres
- Aldershot and Salisbury Plain, *see* those titles.

Military Manœuvres Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *June 22*, 742.
  - *Com.*, *June 25*, 883.
  - *Rep.** *June 26*, 1031.

Military Works Loan, 1899
- Grants for Volunteer Rifle Ranges—Copy Presented, *June 18*, 256, 275.

Militia
- Adjutants and Quartermasters' Training Allowances—Additional Grant-in-aid
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lowe, Mr. Warner; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 285.
- Army Commissions
  - Competitive Examinations, Literary Subjects—Officers at Out Stations, etc.
    - *Q.* Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 437.
  - Seniority of University Candidates, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Boscawen; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 780.
- Clothing of Militiamen — Old Cast-off Clothing
  - *Os.* Mr. Warner, *June 19*, 488; Mr. Wyndham, 492.
- Officers
  - Leave of Absence—Short Periods of Leave
    - *Q.* Mr. C. E. Shaw; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 438.
  - Line Officers and Stoppage of Retired Pay on Embodiment
    - *Os.* Mr. Boscawen, *June 19*, 501, 503; Mr. J. P. Williams, 502.
  - Senior Major's Pay—Additional Pay of Second-in-Command
    - *Q.* Mr. Boscawen; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 780.

[*cont.*

Militia—*cont.*
Recruits Raised in 1899—Proportion Enlisted in Ireland
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 902.
South African War—Derbyshire Militia, *see* South African War — Sherwood Foresters.

Militia Ballot Bill
l. 2R.* *June 25*, 878.

Milk Trade
Barn Gallon, Use of, etc.
O. Mr. Loyd, *June 22*, 816.
Presumptive Standard of Quality
O. Mr. Kearley, *June 22*, 819.
Report of Departmental Committee
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Long, *June 28*, 1338.

Milward, Col. [Warwick, Stratford-upon-Avon]
Education—Dismissal of Teachers, etc., *June 14*, 95.
Midwives Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1256.

Mineral Rights
Purchase of, *see* Wales — North Wales Lunatic Asylum.

Miners
Return to Transvaal — Sir A. Milner's Warning against Premature Return
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 28*, 1323.

Mines (Prohibition of Child Labour Underground) Bill
*l. Rep.** *June 26*, 1030.

Mint
Vote for, *June 22*, 838—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Mitchell, Private
Discharge from Woolwich Hospital, Removal to Lambeth Workhouse
Qs. Sir E. Gourley, Mr. Marks; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 616.

Money-lending Bill
c. 2R., *June 21*, 681; *June 26*, 1187.

Money-lending Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *June 21*, 681; *June 26*, 1187.
Co-operative Banks and Loan Clubs, 713, 733.
Committee, Evidence before—Cases of Hardship, etc., 682, 684, 690, 704, 708, 711, 721.
County Court Judges, Discretionary Powers of, 683, 694, 696, 701, 704, 705, 707, 709, 711, 724, 726, 727, 1190, 1195, 1199.
"Harsh and Unconscionable" Cases, 685, 697, 702, 707, 719, 724, 1189, 1191, 1195.

Money-lending Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading—*cont.*
False Statements, etc., by Money-lenders, 686, 688, 708, 710. 717, 720, 726, 730, 1194.
Indian Contract Act—Judges' Discretionary Powers, 712.
Isaac Gordon, 682, 697, 699, 1187.
Liverpool, Borrowers in—Judge Collier's Evidence before the Committee, 691.
Minors, Loans to—Circulars, etc., 689, 717, 1194.
Money-lender, Definition of, 687, 704, 710, 718, 1187, 1199.
Rate of Interest on Loans, 685, 693, 696, 700, 706, 711, 714, 716, 724, 733, 1188, 1189, 1195, 1199.
Pawnbrokers' Rate of Interest, etc., 697, 699, 723.
Registration of Money-lenders, 683, 709, 717, 730, 1187, 1194.
Registration of Securities, etc., 711.
Usury Laws, Abolition of, 687, 1189, 1195.

Monkswell, Lord
Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 264; *Com.*, *June 28*, 1269, 1271, 1272.
Military Lands Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 579, 581; *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1297.
Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *June 22*, 741, 742.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 577; *Re-com.*, *June 28*, 1279.

Montagu, Mr. J. S. [Hants, New Forest]
Aldershot Heat Casualties — Want of Suitable Headgear, *June 19*, 490.

Montagu of Beaulieu, Lord
Military Manœuvres Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 883, 884.

Monteath, Mr.
Report on Indian Famine Relief
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 19*, 440, 441.

Montmorency, Viscount Frankfort de
Election as Representative Peer for Ireland—Writs and Returns, etc., Presented, *June 18*, 249.
Took the Oath, *June 18*, 249.

Moore, Mr. A. J. [Londonderry]
Food Stuffs—Importation of Fraudulent Food Stuffs, *June 22*, 817.

Moore, Mr. W. [Antrim, N.]
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1400.

Morecambe Urban District Council (Gas) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 21*, 574.
3R.* *June 25*, 875.
Witness Ordered to attend Select Committee, *June 18*, 250.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, W.]
Great Indian Peninsula Railway Stock—Class D Annuities, Amount of Five per Cent. Stock, etc., *June 25*, 907.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Com.*, *June 20*, 557.

Morley, Earl of—*Chairman of Committees*
Military Lands Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 582; *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1295, 1297.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J. [Montrose, etc.]
British Museum Bill, *June 18*, 297.
Withdrawal of Bill, *June 28*, 1351.
British Museum and Irish Gold Ornaments—Laying Correspondence between Treasury and Museum Trustees on the Table, *June 21*, 635.

"Morning Leader"
Foreign Office Papers—Advance Copies to the Press
Q. Mr. B. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 22*, 783.

Morocco
European Intervention, proposed—Public Sale of Slaves, etc.
Q. Mr. Hazell; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 18*, 288.

Morrell, Mr. G. H. [Oxon, Woodstock]
Education—Training Colleges, Curriculum for Rural Teachers, etc., *June 15*, 177.

Morris, Lord
Cromwell Statue, Erection of, within the Precincts of the Palace of Westminster without the Consent of Parliament, *June 21*, 595.

Morris, Mr. S. [Kilkenny, S.]
Land Purchase—Sales to Tenants under Section 40 of Land Act, *June 26*, 1138.

Morton, Mr. E. J. C. [Devonport]
Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, *June 18*, 327.

Motherwell Water Bill
*c. Con.** *June 18*, 270.
3R.* *June 21*, 605.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 22*, 739; *June 25*, 874.

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *June 25*, 890.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 266.

Motor Cars
Speed Regulations — Compelling Motor Cars to carry distinctive Number
Q. Mr. Price; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 22*, 788.

Moulton, Mr. J. F. [Cornwall, Launceston]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com. June 25*, 989, 1011.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con. June 20*, 548, 563.

Mount Pleasant
Transfer of Work from General Post Office, *see* Post Office.

Mountain Ash Water Bill
c. 3R.* *June 14*, 1.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 18*, 252; *June 28*, 1265.

Mounted Infantry Volunteers
see Volunteers.

Muirkirk, Mauchline and Dalmellington Railways (Abandonment) Bill
Board of Trade Report Presented, *June 14*, 8.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1110.

Municipal Trading
Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *see* that title.

Murnaghan, Mr. G. [Tyrone, Mid]
Allen's, Andrew, Holding — Sale of, at Irvinestown, *June 22*, 89; *June 28*, 1343.
Great Northern of Ireland Railway — Preferential Rates, *June 26*, 1136.
Money-lending Bill, 2R. *June 21*, 719.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *June 28*, 1403.

Murray, Col. C. W. [Bath]
Enteric Fever, Inoculation against, in South Africa—Results, *June 26*, 1117.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Lord Advocate* [Buteshire]
Barlinnie Prison—Payment of Fines by Prisoners, *June 26*, 1135.
Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill, 3R. *June 18*, 382.
Greenock Board School—Providing Prizes out of School Fund, *June 28*, 1343.
Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill, 2R. *June 18*, 403.
Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, 3R. *June 21*, 662.
Sheriffship of Ross and Cromarty—Mr. Smith's Parliamentary Candidature, *June 19*, 446.
Stornoway Secondary Education School, Erection of, *June 25*, 912.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*cont.*
Training Colleges
Admission, Qualifications — Queen's Scholarship Candidates' Grievance, *June 21*, 632.
Trained Teachers — Inadequate Supply, *June 21*, 631.
Trawling in Loch Fyne, Suppression of, *June 25*, 913.

Museum Grants for Wales
Os. Mr. H. Lewis, *June 15*, 160; Sir J. Gorst, 169.

National Debt
Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Accounts Presented, *June 27*, 1208; *June 28*, 1268.

National Debt Office
Vote for, *June 22*, 839.

National Gallery
Danger from Fire—Proposed Isolation
Qs. Lord Balcarres, Mr. Middlemore; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 15*, 157.
Proximity of St. George's Barracks
Q. Dr. Farquharson, *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 15*, 157; *Os.* Dr. Farquharson, Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 498, 500.
Vote for, *June 15*, 190—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

National Physical Laboratory
Erection of, in Old Deer Park
Os. Lord Balcarres, Mr. Hanbury, *June 15*, 192.

National Portrait Gallery
Annual Report Presented, *June 19*, 412, 432.
Vote for, *June 15*, 190.

National Rifle Association
Rifle Clubs affiliated to, etc.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1124.

National School Teachers, Ireland
Examinations for Promotion—Claims of Teachers
Q. Sir T. Lea; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 915.
Pension Fund—Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *see* that title.
Results Fees
Killylea National School—Payment of Arrears
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 21*, 635.
Schools Examined on or after April 1, 1900—Payment of Fees
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 22*, 789.

National Telephone Company
Post Office—Delivery of Telegrams over the Company's Wires, Instruction to Postmasters
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 911.

Naval Forces in Land Warfare
China Crisis—Admiral Seymour Commanding Land Forces, Russian Admiral Commanding Naval Forces
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 25*, 905; *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1118; *Q.* Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1119.
Composition of Admiral Seymour's Naval Force on Land, etc.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1119.
Forces withdrawn from H.M. Ships
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 22*, 782.
Dual Naval and Military Organisations, Naval Stations Abroad, etc.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 26*, 1123.

Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill
l. 2R., *June 19*, 413.
Com., *June 25*, 885.
Rep. June 25*, 885.
3R.* *June 26*, 1058.

Naval Works
Statement Presented, *June 21*, 614.

Navigation and Shipping
Annual Statement Presented, *June 18*, 256, 274.

Navy
First Lord—Rt. Hon. G. J. Goschen.
Lord of the Admiralty—Mr. Austen Chamberlain.
Secretary—Mr. W. E. Macartney.

Boilers—Water-tube Boilers
"Europa," H.M.S.—Speed of Voyage to Australia, Coal Consumption —H.M.S. "Hell," etc.
Q. Mr. Allan; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 15*, 149.
"Hermes," H.M.S.—Breakdown
Qs. Sir F. Flannery, Mr. Allan; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1330.
Performance of Ships fitted with Belleville Boilers, etc.—Statement
Qs. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1329.
"Terrible," H.M.S.—Speed of Voyage from Hong Kong to Ta-ku
Qs. Sir F. Flannery, Mr. Allan; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 132
Cape of Good Hope Observatory—Report Presented, *June 18*, 276; *June 21*, 575.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
Channel Fleet, Visit to Shetland proposed—Visits from German Ships, etc.
Q. Sir L. Lyell; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 18*, 285.
Chaplains, Deficiency of—North American and West Indian Stations
Q. Mr. Peel; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1331.
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc., *see* China—British Forces, etc.
Deptford Victualling Yard—Overtime Records, Inaccurate System
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 26*, 1127.
Dockyard Employees as Volunteers—Civil Pay during Camp Training
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 902.
Dual (Naval and Military) Organisation—Naval Foreign Stations, Events in China, etc.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 26*, 1123.
Greenwich Hospital and Travers' Foundation, Income and Expenditure—Statement Presented, *June 21*, 576, 614.
Gunboats and Inland Navigation in China, *see* China—British Gunboats.
Hydrographer's Report Presented, *June 18*, 276; *June 21*, 575.
Manœuvres—Number and Class of Ships to be Employed, Coaling from Colliers at Sea, etc.
Q. Sir E. Gourley; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 19*, 439.
Marine Pensioners, Discharge of, from Hospital—Case of Roberts
Q. Sir J. Baker; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1126.
Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill, *see* that title.
Pay, Non-Effective Pay and Allowances—Exceptions to Queen's Regulations, List Presented, *June 19*, 432.
Sailors on Active Service—Petitions for Legislation, *June 18*, 274; *June 19*, 429.
Shipbuilding Vote—Date of Introduction
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1127.
Training Ships, *see* that title.
Training Squadron—Dismantling of Sailing Ships, Training of Seamen, etc.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1128.
Whales, Col., and the Peckham Roman Catholic Disturbance
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 18*, 293.
Workmen's Compensation Act
Extension to Sailors
Q. Mr. M'Kenna; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 279; *Q.* Col. Pryce-Jones; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 920.
Number of Men Receiving Compensation, Amount of Compensation, etc.—Address for Return, *June 14*, 10.

Neath Harbour Bill
c. Rep. June 25*, 891.

Netherlands
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254, 256.

New Brighton
Ferry between Bootle and New Brighton
O. Mr. P. O'Brien, *June 25*, 886.

New Guinea, British
Report for 1898–99 Presented, *June 26*, 1029, 1114.

New Peers
see Peers.

New Quay
Water Supply, Condition of
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 916.

New South Wales
Governor of—Australian Commonwealth Bill, Objections to Governor's Intervention
Qs. Mr. Maclean, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 908; *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.

New Zealand
Boundaries, Enlargement of, Proposed—Incorporation of Neighbouring Islands
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1129.
Wagons, Supply of, for the British Army, etc.
Os. Mr. Warner, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 461, 468.

Newdigate, Mr. F. A. [Warwickshire, Nuneaton]
Artillery and Engineer Lieutenants—Promotion Regulations, *June 22*, 779.

Newport Corporation Bill
c. Con. June 14* (2).
3R.* *June 18*, 269.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 19*, 412; *June 21*, 573.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill
c. Con. June 14*, 2.
3R.* *June 18*, 269.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
Petition, *June 26*, 1025.
Standing Orders, *June 28*, 1266.

Newspapers
Foreign Office Papers—Advance Copies to the Press
Q. Mr. B. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 22*, 783.

Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn Urban District Gas Bill
*c. Con.** *June 14*, 2.
3R.* *June 18*, 269.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 19*, 412; *June 21*, 573.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Non-County Boroughs Bill
c. 2R.* *June 27*, 1263.

Nonconformists
Ritualistic Teaching in Church Schools and Board Schools — Nonconformists' Grievance
Smith, Mr. S., on, *June 14*, 47—Sir J. Gorst's Reply, 58.
Training Colleges—Nonconformists' Grievance
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 53; *June 15*, 160.

Norfolk
Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreaks—Restrictions on Movement of Cattle, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 805.

North American Naval Station
Deficiency of Chaplains
Q. Mr. Peel; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1331.

North British Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Com., *June 19*, 410.
3R.* *June 22*, 738.
c. 1R.* *June 22*, 770.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1108.

North Eastern Railway Bill
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 267; *June 26*, 1110.

North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill
c. 2R.* *June 25*, 890.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 267.

North Metropolitan Railway and Canal Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 25*, 876.

North Wales Lunatic Asylum
see Wales.

North Warwickshire Water Bill
l. Committed, *June 18*, 250.
*Rep.** *June 26*, 1026.

Norton, Capt. C. W. [Newington, W.]
Army
Half-pay Officers—Outfit Allowance, *June 25*, 900.
Horses—Veterinary Officers and the Transport of Horses at Sea, etc., *June 19*, 465.
Pimlico Clothing Factory, Sanitary Condition, *June 19*, 493, 498.
Veterinary Department, Officers' Titles, etc., *June 19*, 451; *June 26*, 1125.

Norton, Capt. C. W.—*cont.*
Deptford Victualling Yard—Overtime Records, Inaccurate System, *June 26*, 1127.
Rifle Clubs—Ammunition and Mauser Rifles taken from the Boers—Utilising for Rifle Ranges, *June 19*, 494, 496.
Salisbury Plain Manœuvres—Volunteer Canteen Arrangements, Restricting to Army Contractors, *June 21*, 622.
South African War—Hospital Arrangements at Bloemfontein, Mr. Burdett-Coutts's Charges — Inquiry, *June 28*, 1314.
Volunteer Camps—Dockyard Employees in Devonshire Regiment, Pay, etc., *June 25*, 901.

Nottingham Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 18*, 251.

Nursing Sisters
Army—Increase of Pension proposed
Q. Mr. Boscawen; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 777.

O'Brien, Mr. J. F. X. [Cork]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*; *June 25*, 978.
Malta—Tunny Nets Tax, *June 15*, 150.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
Army and Militia Recruits—Percentage raised in Ireland, *June 25*, 902.
Brighton Telegraphist—Efficiency Barrier, Case of Simmons, *June 28*, 1341.
Cootehill Postmastership — Applications and Appointment, *June 25*, 914.
Fenians under Arrest at Mafeking, alleged, *June 25*, 898.
Ferry between Bootle and New Brighton, *June 25*, 886, 887.
Intermediate Education Programme — Delay in Publishing, *June 14*, 17.
Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill, *Con.*, *June 15*, 129; *June 25*, 886.
Peckham Disturbance — Col. Whale's Attack on Roman Catholic Procession, *June 18*, 293.
South African War—Outrages on Boer Women and Children by British Troops, Boer Allegations, *June 15*, 141.

O'Brien of Kilfenora, Baron
New Peer—Introduced, *June 25*, 874.

O'Connor, Mr. A. [Donegal E.]
Tithe Rent-charge
Arrears, Recovery of
Proceedings for Recovery, *June 28*, 1347.
Receivers, Appointment of—Cost of Proceedings, Fees, etc., *June 28*, 1347, 1348.
Redemption — Costs and Expenses, *June 28*, 1349.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1422.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]
Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, *June 15*, 147.
Greystones — Removal of Gravel from Foreshore, *June 28*, 1335.
Indian Famine and Plague Statistics—Imperial Grant, *June 15*, 153, 154, 157.
Rate Books — Omission of Names of Owners and Lessees, *June 28*, 1345.
Labourers Act Schedule, *June 18*, 295.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1081.
Liverpool Postal Staff
Inspectors of Telegraph Messengers performing duties of Telegraphists, *June 28*, 1341.
Number of Temporary Sorting Clerks and Telegraphists, *June 28*, 1340.

O'Keeffe, Mr. F. A. [Limerick]
Crown Quit Rents, Ireland, *June 28*, 1336.
Kilrush and Foynes, Steamer Communication between, *June 28*, 1346.

Oldham Corporation Bill
c. Con., *June 26*, 1099.
3R., *June 26*, 1107.
l. 1R.* *June 28*, 1266.
Report from Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills, *June 18*, 271.

Oldham Corporation Bill
Debate on, Considered as Amended, *June 26*, 1099.
Inspection
Authority Ordering, etc., 1099, 1101, 1103, 1107.
Sources of Milk Supply, 1099.
Model Clauses, Leeds Clause, 1099, 1101, 1103, 1105, 1106.

Omnibus Horses
South African War — Appreciation of Omnibus Horses—Twice mentioned in Despatches
O. Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 457.

Opium Cultivation
India—Using Land for the Production of Food, proposed
Q. Mr. Colville; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 25*, 907.

Orange Free State
see also Orange River Colony.

Orange River Colony
Penny Postage
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 620.

Ossett Corporation Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. Lords Amendts.* *June 25*, 889.

Otley Urban District Council Water Bill
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Owens College, Manchester
Insufficient Grant-in-aid
O. Sir F. S. Powell, *June 15*, 195.

Oxford and Cambridge Universities
Statutes Presented, *June 18*, 258, 276.

Paignton Urban District Water Bill
*c. Con.** *June 14*, 2.
3R.* *June 25*, 889.
l. Commons Amendts.* *June 26*, 1028; *June 28*, 1265.

Pakhoi
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Palmer, Mr. G. W. [Reading]
South African War, British Prisoners Released, Publication of Names, *June 22*, 776.

Parcels
South African War, *see* that title.

Paris
Inter-Parliamentary Conference — Leave of Absence for Members
Q. Mr. Pierpoint; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 22*, 793.

Paris Exhibition
Vote for, *June 19*, 504.

Parliament
Blocking Notices, Mr. J. Lowther's Notice of Motion (Hospital Arrangements in South Africa)
Os. Mr. J. Lowther, The Speaker, *June 28*, 1313.
Dissolution Prospects — Registration of Parliamentary Voters
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 296.
(*see also* titles House of Commons and House of Lords.)

"Parliamentary Debates"
Condensed Reports, Reporting in the Third Person, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 841.

Parliamentary Elections
Polling Places, *see* that title.

Parliamentary Papers
Foreign Office Papers—Advance Copies to the Press
Q. Mr. B. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 22*, 783.
Pink Paper—Reports as to Charities, etc.
O. Mr. Humphreys-Owen, *June 22*, 841.

Parliamentary Voters
Alteration of Registration—Dissolution of Parliament
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 296.

Passenger Luggage
see Luggage.

Patent Office
Committee Report Presented, *June 14*, 8; *June 18*, 255.

Patriotic Commissioners
War Funds Committee Recommendations
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 28*, 1319.

Paulton, Mr. J. M. [Durham, Bishop Auckland]
South African War—Hospital Arrangements at Bloemfontein—Mr. Burdett-Coutts' Charges, Inquiry, *June 28*, 1314.

Pauper Children
Boarding-out — Number of Boards of Guardians Boarding out Children, Voluntary Committees, etc.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Chaplin; *June 18*, 291.
Education—Elementary Education Bill, *June 21*, 670, 671, 672, 674, 676, 678.
Poor Law Schools
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 70.
Public Elementary Schools, Number of Boards of Guardians sending Children to, etc.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *June 18*, 291.
Southall Schools, Expenditure on—Increased Accommodation, Cost per head, etc.
Q. Mr. Spicer; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *June 28*, 1338.

Pauper Lunatics
St. Pancras Scandal,
Debate (Lords), *June 26*, 1059.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 835.

Pawnbrokers
Ireland—Returns from City Marshal of Dublin Presented, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 258.

Pease, Mr. J. A. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
Birmingham (King Edward the Sixth) Schools Bill, 3R., *June 22*, 763.
South African War
Boer Prisoners at St. Helena—Treatment of British Troops and Boer Prisoners, *June 25*, 896.
Enteric Fever, Inoculation against—Results, *June 28*, 1321.
Medical Arrangements, Inefficiency, Disorganisation, etc.—Papers, *June 28*, 1432.
Zanzibar, Slavery in, Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc., *June 15*, 218.

Peckham
Disturbance—Roman Catholic Open air Procession
Powers of the Commissioner of Police
Q. Colonel Sandys; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 18*, 292.
Whale's, Col., Attack on Procession
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 18*, 293.

Peel, Mr. W. R. W. [Manchester, S.]
Naval Chaplains, Deficiency of—North American and West Indian Stations, *June 28*, 1331.

Peers
New Peers
Alverstone of Alverstone, Baron—Introduced, *June 18*, 249.
O'Brien of Kilfenora, Baron—Introduced, *June 25*, 874.
Representative Peers for Ireland, *see* that title.
Sat First in Parliament
Argyll, Duke of, after the death of his Father, *June 19*, 409.
Clancarty, Earl of, after the death of his Father, *June 22*, 737.
Londesborough, Earl of, after the death of his Father, *June 25*, 874.
Winchester, Marquess of, after the death of his Brother, *June 18*, 249.

Peking
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.

Pemba
Slave Trade
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 216. (*Division: A. 39; N. 94.*)

Penal Servitude Acts
Conditional Licences granted, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 257.

Penny-in-the-Slot Machines
Victoria Station — Public defrauded of Money
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 28*, 1336.

Penny Post
Orange River Colony and the Transvaal, Extension to
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 620.

Percy, Earl [Kensington, S.]
Turkey—Reduction of Consular Establishments in Provinces of Asiatic Turkey, *June 15*, 211.

Persian Gulf
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill
  c. 2R.* *June 19*, 422.
  Standing Orders, *June 18*, 268.

Petitions
  Public Petitions Committee—Report Presented, *June 20*, 571.

Petty Customs Abolition (Scotland) Bill
  Petitions, *June 15*, 134; *June 20*, 505; *June 21*, 608; *June 22*, 770.

Philippine Islands
  Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Phillpotts, Capt. [Devon, Torquay]
  Parliamentary Debates, *June 22*, 845.

Physical Laboratory
  Erection of, in Old Deer Park
    Os. Lord Balcarres, Mr. Hanbury, *June 15*, 192.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
  Eviction of Tenants—Summary Powers of Landlords, etc., *June 28*, 1337.
  Gas Light and Coke Company — Charges, *June 25*, 909.
  Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 923, 924, 925, 944, 991, 994.
  Parliamentary Voters — Alteration of Registration, *June 18*, 296.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
  c. 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
    *Rep.** *June 22*, 766,
    *Con.** and 3R.* *June 25*, 890.
  l. 1R.* *June 25*, 877.
    2R.* *June 26*, 1029.
  Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1025.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
  c. 2R.* *June 18*, 270.
    *Rep.** *June 25*, 891.
    *Con.** *June 26*, 1109.
    3R.* *June 27*, 1205.
  l. 1R.* *June 28*, 1267.
  Memorandum Ordered, *June 15*, 138; Presented, *June 18*, 274.
  Special Board of Trade Report Ordered, *June 25*, 896; Report Presented *June 26*, 1114.
  Standing Orders, *June 15*, 130.

Pierpoint, Mr. R. [Warrington]
  Cyprus—Conversion of Crimean Loan of 1855, *June 15*, 245.
  Inter-Parliamentary Conference at Paris—Leave of Absence for Members, *June 22*, 793.

Piershill Barracks
  Sanitary Condition, etc.
    Os. Dr. Farquharson, *June* 19, 498; Mr. J. P. Williams, 500.

Platt-Higgins, Mr. F. [Salford, N.]
  Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1234, 1240, 1241.

Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. C.—*Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland* [Dublin County, S.]
  Science Teachers—Summer Classes, Fee Grievance, etc., *June 28*, 1351.
  Trawling, Illegal, in Irish Waters
    Ardglass Herring Fishery, Decrease in, etc., *June 25*, 917.
    Kerry Mackerel Fisheries—Destruction of Nets, *June 25*, 918; *June 28*, 1350.

Plymouth Stonehouse, and Devonport Tramways Bill
  *c. Rep.** *June 25*, 891.

Police
  Peckham Disturbance—Powers of Chief Commissioner
    Q. Col. Sandys; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 18*, 292.

Polling Districts
  Lancaster, County Palatine of—County Council Order Presented, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 258.

Pondicherry
  Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Poor Law
  Pauper Children, Pauper Lunatics, etc., *see* those titles.

Poor Law Schools
  Education Department Control, etc., Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 70.

Poor Rate Collectors
  Ulster—Refusal to accept part-payment of Rate
    Q. Mr. Archdale; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1343.

Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill
  c. Intro. and 1R.* *June 21*, 638.

Poor Removal Bill
  l. 2R.* *June 25*, 878.
    Com., *June 28*, 1298.

Poor Removal Bill
  Debate in Committee, *June 28*, 1298.
    Corroboration of Paupers' statements, 1300.
    One Year Continuous Residence of Pauper in Parish or Union on which application is made for Relief, 1298.

Port of London
  Royal Commission on Docks, *see* Docks.

Portland Urban District Gas Bill
c. *Con.* June 14*, 3.
3R.* *June 18*, 269.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Porto Alegre
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Porto Rico
Trade Report Presented, *June 28*, 1267.

Portrait Gallery
Annual Report Presented, *June 19*, 412, 432.

Portree
Training Ship, Stationing at Portree, proposed
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 913.

Portugal
Trade Report Presented, *June 26*, 1029.

Post Office
Postmaster General — Marquess of Londonderry.
Representative in the House of Commons —Rt. Hon. R. W. Hanbury.
Cootehill Postmastership—Applications and Appointment
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 914.
Edinburgh Post Office—Delay in Revision of Sorting Branch
Q. Mr. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 19*, 445.
Leek Post Office—Insufficient Accommodation
Q. Mr. Bill; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 911.
Mails, *see* that title.
Telegraph Service, *see* that title.
Transfer of Work from General Office to Mount Pleasant—Delay in Delivery of Letters, Earlier Posting of Night Mails, etc.
Qs. Mr. H. Heaton, Mr. Maddison; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 633; *Os.* Earl Stanhope, Marquess of Londonderry, *June 21*, 598; *Q.* Sir A. Rollit; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 1023; *Q.* Mr. Egerton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 735.

Post Office Employees
Counter-Clerks and Telegraphists in London—Relief during Tea-time, proposed
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 22*, 786.
Liverpool, *see* that title.
Postmen, *see* that title.
Sunday Duty—Compulsory Duty on all the Staff, Limit of Duty, etc.
Qs. Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Channing; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 18*, 294.

Post Office Savings Banks
Accounts—Amount Standing to Credit of Deposit Accounts untouched for more than ten years
Q. Sir E. Vincent; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *June 19*, 444.
Trustee and Post Office Savings Banks—Profit and Loss to the Treasury
Q. Sir E. Vincent; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *June 19*, 445.

Post Office Sites
Expenses, Committee, *June 14*, 20; *June 18*, 40; *June 21*, 734—Report, *June 22*, 865.

Post Office Sites Bill
Members of Select Committee nominated, *June 22*, 794.

Postage Rates
Penny Post—Extension to Orange River Colony and the Transvaal
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 620.

Postmen
Volunteer Camps—Granting leave on Full Pay to Assistant Postmen, proposed
Q. Col. Dalbiac; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 622.
W.C.D. Office Auxiliary Postmen and the Tweedmouth Report—Grievance
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 22*, 785.

Potteries
Lead Poisoning, *see* that title.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
British Museum—Grant-in-aid, Audit of Accounts, etc., *June 15*, 190.
Burial Grounds Bill, *Con.*, *June 18*, 396.
Education — Pauper Children, Code of 1900, etc., *June 14*, 89.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 952, 987, 1007, 1011.
Universities and Colleges, Grants-in-aid—Victoria University, etc., *June 15*, 194.

Prayers
Intercessory Prayer, Form of — Petition from Church of England Union of New South Wales, *June 15*, 135.

Premier
Marquess of Salisbury.

Press
Foreign Office Papers, Advance Copies to the Press—Case of the *Morning Leader*
Q. Mr. B. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 22*, 783.

Preston Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 426.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 888.

Pretyman, Capt. E. G. [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 943.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 561; 3R., *June 27*, 1220, 1223.

Prevention of Corruption Bill
l. Com., *June 28*, 1273.
Report from Select Committee, *June 22*, 740.

Price, Mr. R. J. [Norfolk, E.]
Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreak in Norfolk and Suffolk—Question of Compensation, etc., *June 22*, 805.
Motor Car Speed Regulations, *June 22*, 788.
Volunteers—Orderly Room Sergeant holding Rank of Quartermaster-Sergeant, Camp Pay, etc., *June 26*, 1126.

Printing and Stationery
Vote for, *June 22*, 841—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Prisoners of War
see South African War.

Prisons
Pensions of Prison Officials—Increase of Warder Searle's Pension, proposed
Q. Mr. Cornwallis; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1132.
Scotland
Barlinnie Prison—Payment of Fines by Prisoners
Q. Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 26*, 1135.
Dietaries, Rules Presented, *June 14*, 8; *June 18*, 257.
Report of Departmental Committee Presented, *June 19*, 412, 431.

Private Bills
Committees—Selection of Members, etc.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Halsey, *June 25*, 919.
Group D—Report from Committee, *June 19*, 423; *June 20*, 505.
Group J—Report from Committee, *June 19*, 423; *June 26*, 1109; *June 27*, 1263.
Group K—Witness Ordered to attend Select Committee, *June 26*, 1110.
Special Facilities for passing Bills this Session — Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Midwives Bill, etc.
Qs. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Egerton; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 920.

Private Members' Days
see Business of the House.

Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bill
Standing Orders suspended, *June 22*, 739.

Privy Council
Salary of Registrar, etc.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Hanbury, *June 22*, 803, 804.
Vote for, *June 22*, 803.

Produce Markets
Petition for Establishment in London, *June 14*, 3.

Promotion from the Ranks
see South African War.

Provand, Mr. A. D. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1234, 1245.

Provincial Mails
Earlier Posting, *see* Post Office—Transfer of work to Mount Pleasant, etc.

Provisional Order Bills
Suggested Distinctive Titles
Os. Mr. Buxton, Mr. T. W. Russell, Sir C. Dilke, *June 19*, 416, 417.

Pryce-Jones, Col. E. [Montgomery Boroughs]
Army, Reserve of Officers—Officers of Volunteer Corps Outfit Allowance on Rejoining Regular Army, etc., *June 25*, 901.
Machynlleth Rifle Range, Completion of, *June 21*, 624.
Volunteer Officers gazetted to Army Commissions—Refunding Outfit Allowance, *June 28*, 1326.
Workmen's Compensation Act — Extension to Naval and Military Servants, *June 25*, 920.

Public Accounts
Leave given for the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend Select Committee, *June 21*, 577.

Public Health (Ireland) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Public Houses (Scotland) Later Opening Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 134; *June 18*, 172; *June 27*, 1206.

Public Income and Expenditure
Return Ordered, *June 25*, 896.

Public Libraries Bill
c. 1R.* *June 14*, 20.

Public Petitions
Committee—Rep. Presented, *June 20*, 571.

Public Records
see Records.

Public Works Loan Commission
Vote for, *June 22*, 840.

Pupil Teachers
Supply of, etc.—Sir J. Gorst's Statement, *June 14*, 20.
(*see also* Education — Teachers, Supply of, etc.)

Queen Anne's Bounty Board
Select Committee of Inquiry—Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, Message to the Lords, *June 27*, 1262.

Quilter, Sir C. [Suffolk, Sudbury]
Cattle Diseases—Burial of Carcases, etc., *June 22*, 818.

Quit Rents (Ireland)
Application of Relief of Local Taxation, proposed
Q. Mr. O'Keeffe; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *June 28*, 1336.

Rabais
Church Missionary Station—Placing outside Dominions of Sultan of Zanzibar
Q. Mr. Duckworth; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 152.

Railway Bills
Group 7—Report from Com., *June 19*, 422.

Railway Companies Powers Act, 1864
Board of Trade Report Presented, *June 19*, 413.

Railways
Accidents
Brecon Goods Yard, Fatality in — Board of Trade Inquiry
Q. Mr. Maddison; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 14*, 15.
Slough, Official Report — Number of Trains in consequence of Windsor Races
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 21*; 632.
Aldershot Government Railway Siding—Erection of Roof
Q. Mr. Jeffreys; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 902.
Bills relating to, *see* their titles.
Board of Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 275.
Foreign Countries, *see* their names.
Ireland
Clones Level Crossing and Platform—Report of Inspector
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 25*, 913.
Great Northern Railway—Preferential Rates
Q. Mr. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1136.

Railways—*cont.*
London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway Act, 1894—Delay in Completion of Railway, Abandonment Bills
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 14*, 14.
Luggage, *see* that title.

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill
l. 1R.* *June 22*, 741.
2R. *June 28*, 1274.
c. 3R. *June 21*, 658.
Petition, *June 26*, 1111.

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill
Debate on Third Reading (Commons), *June 21*, 658; and Second Reading (Lords), *June 28*, 1274.
Accidents among Railway Servants, 1274.
Accidents in "Dangerous Trades," 1276.
Automatic Couplings, 1278.
Board of Trade, Powers of, 1277.
Scotland, Application of the Bill to
Appeals, 659, 660, 662, 664, 665.
Scotch Procedure, 658, 661, 662, 663, 664.
Sheriffs' Courts, etc., 659, 661.

Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill
l. Report from Select Com., *June 18*, 251.
3R.* *June 21*, 573.
c. 1R. *June 22*, 770.
Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1107.

Rangoon
Outrage by British Soldiers—Names of Officials Responsible for Failure of Justice, etc.
Q. Sir L. M'Iver; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *June 22*, 784.

Rasch, Major F. C. [Essex, S.E.]
Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, *June 15*, 143; *June 22*, 778.
Army
Horses, Supply of Remounts—Purchasing *v.* Breeding, etc., *June 19*, 449.
Provisions, Forage, etc., *June 19*, 475.
Home Defence—Organisation of the Land Forces, etc., *June 19*, 437.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 730.
Volunteer Mounted Infantry, Government Grant, *June 22*, 778.

Rate Books
Ireland—Omission of Names of Lessees and Owners
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 18*, 295; *June 28*, 1345.

Rating
Local Taxation, *see* that title.

Rating of Woodlands
- Petition, *June 21*, 608.

Reading Corporation (Tramways) Bill
- *l.* Report from Committee of Selection, *June 25*, 876.

Re-afforestation
- Wales
  - *O.* Mr. H. Lewis, *June 22*, 847.

Rebels in South Africa
- *see* South African War.

Records
- Court of Exchequer—Documents of not sufficient value to justify preservation, Schedule Presented, *June 26*, 1030, 1114.
- Land Revenue Record Office—Public Inspection of Records
  - *Q.* Mr. Woods; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *June 19*, 446.

Record Office
- Vote for, *June 22*, 839.
- Welsh Documents — Appointment of Welsh-speaking Member of the Record Office
  - Reference to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 839, 840.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
- Aldershot Manœuvres—Heat Casualties, etc., *June 15*, 143.
- Ardglass Herring Fishery—Illegal Trawling, etc., *June 25*, 917.
- Clare Co.—Delays in fixing Fair Rents, *June 18*, 296.
- Commonwealth of Australia Bill
  - Intervention of Colonial Governors, *June 25*, 908; *June 26*, 1129.
  - Privy Council Appeal Compromise Clause, neglecting to consult Queensland Delegate, alleged, *June 15*, 152.
- District Councillors' Qualifications—Irish Labourers Acts, *June 25*, 918.
- Enlistment of Under-age Recruits—Case D. Dundass, *June 25*, 903.
- India
  - Budget, Date of Introduction, *June 25*, 922.
  - Famine—Dr. Kloptsch's Report, Appointment of Royal Commission proposed, etc., *June 15*, 154.
  - Honnibal Shooting Case, *June 26*, 1131.
- Irish Gold Ornaments in the British Museum, Transferring to Ireland, *June 15*, 179, 185, 186.
- Ladysmith, Siege of—Imperial Government's Claim on Mayor for Food supplied from Military Stores, *June 18*, 277.
- National School Teachers—Result Fees, Schools Examined on or after April 1, 1900, *June 22*, 789.
- New Quay Water Supply, *June 25*, 916.

Reformatories and Industrial Schools
- Elementary Education Bill, *June 21*, 673, 680.
- Irish Children, Admission of, to English and Scotch Reformatories
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 25*, 914.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Scotland) Bill
- Petitions, *June 15*, 134.

Regent's Park
- Inclosures—Renewal of Leases, etc.
  - Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 850.

Registrar General's Office, England
- Vote for, *June 22*, 840.
- Welsh Census
  - *O.* Mr. H. Lewis, *June 22*, 840.

Registration of Firms Bill
- Select Committee
  - Member Discharged and Member Appointed in Substitution, *June 21*, 735; *June 26*, 1203.

Registration of Voters
- Alteration of Parliamentary Register—Dissolution of Parliament
  - *Q.* Mr. Pickersgill: *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 296.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]
- Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 18*, 353, 364.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act, (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 928, 936.

Relieving Officers
- St. Pancras "Lunacy Scandal," *see* St. Pancras.

Religious Instruction in Schools
- Parental Indifference
  - *O.* Mr. Birrell, *June 14*, 64.
- Secondary Education Bill, *June 26*, 1041.
- Smith, Mr. S., on, *June 14*, 47—Sir J. Gorst's Reply, 58.

Representative Peers for Ireland
- Frankfort de Montmorency, Viscount
  - Election—Writs and Returns, etc., Presented, *June 18*, 249.
  - Took the Oath, *June 18*, 249.
- Inchiquin's, Baron
  - Right to Vote Established, *June 25*, 873.
    - Petition, *June 18*, 249.

Reserve Forces Bill
- *l.* 2R., *June 22*, 741.
  - *Com.** and *Rep.** *June 25*, 883.
  - *Rep.** *June 26*, 1031.

Reservists
- *see* titles Army and South African War.

Revenue and Expenditure of the United Kingdom
Form of Balance Sheet—Lumping together Sums of National Outlay
Os. Mr. Harwood, Sir M. H. Beach, *June 22*, 798, 800; Mr. G. Bowles, 801.
Return Ordered, *June 25*, 896.

Rhymney Iron Company Bill
l. Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Rhymney Railway Bill
c. Rep. June 22*, 768.

Richards, Mr. H. C. [Finsbury, E.]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 1014.
Strangford Lough Lighthouse—Refusal of Irish Lights Commission to provide Light, *June 14*, 16.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 539, 540.

Richmond Bridge
Account Presented, *June 18*, 259, 276.

Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill
c. Con. June 15*, 130.
3R.* *June 19*, 421.
l. 1R.* *June 19*, 411.
2R.* *June 26*, 1026.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 874.

Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Lancashire, Blackpool]
Burial Grounds Bill, *Con.*, *June 18*, 394, 397, 398, 400.
Clerk of the Peace, Staffordshire—Increase of Pay, *June 21*, 630.
Eviction of Tenants—Summary Power of Landlords, etc., Communication to London Magistrates, *June 28*, 1337.
Factories and Workshops
Date of issue of Chief Inspector's Report, *June 18*, 292.
Jute Factory Regulations—Prosecution of Messrs. Ritchie, *June 25*, 1133.
Lead Poisoning—Returns, *June 21*, 629.
Peckham Disturbance—Roman Catholic Open-air Procession, etc., *June 18*, 293.
Penny-in-the-Slot Machines at Victoria Station, *June 28*, 1337.
Prison Warders' Pensions—Case of Warder Searle, *June 26*, 1132.
Spinks, W., Case of—Walsingham Petty Sessions, *June 26*, 1134.
Superannuation of Teachers, Extending to Isle of Man and Channel Islands—Legislation, *June 21*, 631.

Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.—*cont.*
Vehicle Lights—Side Lights on Covered Vans, *June 18*, 292.
Workmen's Compensation Act
Bailey *v.* Plant, *June 26*, 1133.
Medical Examinations, *June 21*, 631.
Youthful Offenders Bill—Clauses 3 to 18, Passing into Law this Session, etc., *June 25*, 915.

Rifle Clubs
Ammunition—War Office supplying on favourable terms
O. Mr. F. W. Wilson, *June 19*, 494.
Regulations—Formation of Special Department, proposed
Qs. Sir H. Vincent, Mr. Tomlinson; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1124.

Rifle Ranges
Colchester Camp—Opening Range in time for Volunteer Training
Q. Mr. F. W. Wilson; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 438.
Compulsory Acquisition of Sites—Consultative Committee
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1123.
Grants from Military Works Loan 1899—Copy Presented, *June 18*, 256, 275.
Machynlleth Range, Completion of
Q. Col. Pryce-Jones; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 624.
Military Lands Bill, *see* that title.

Rifles
Mauser Rifles and Ammunition taken from the Boers—Utilising for Rifle Clubs, proposed
O. Capt. Norton, *June 19*, 494.
Supply of Rifles—Obsolete Rifles, etc.
O. Mr. Warner, *June 19*, 493.
Volunteers and Royal Reserve Battalions—Delay in issuing Rifles
Qs. Mr. Goulding, Mr. Warner, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 281.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Croydon]
China—British Trade Returns, *June 25*, 906.
Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1139, 1180.
Gas Light and Coke Company's Charges, *June 25*, 910.
Foreshores—Removal of Gravel from Greystones Foreshore, *June 28*, 1335.
London Docks, Royal Commission on—Constitution of Terms of Reference, *June 22*, 787.
Railways
Accidents
Brecon Goods Yard Fatality, *June 14*, 15.
Slough, Official Report, etc., *June 21*, 633.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*cont.*
- Railways—*cont.*
  - Clones Level Crossing and Platform—Inspector's Report, *June 25*, 914.
  - Great Northern of Ireland Railway—Preferential Rates, *June 26*, 1136.
  - London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway Act, 1894—Delay in Completion of Railway, Abandonment Bills, *June 14*, 15.
  - Luggage—Excess Charges, Powers of Board of Trade to regulate Charges, etc., *June 18*, 290.
- Soudan, British Trade with—Statistics, *June 18*, 289.
- Strangford Lough and Carlingford Lough Lighthouses, etc., *June 26*, 1137.

Ritchie, Messrs.
- Jute Factory Regulations Prosecution
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1133.

Ritualism
- Religious Teaching in Schools
  - Parental Indifference
    - *O.* Mr. Birrell, *June 14*, 64.
  - Smith, Mr. S., on, *June 14*, 47—Sir J. Gorst's Reply, 58.

Roberts, Case of
- Marine Pensioner—Discharge from Haslar Hospital
  - *Q.* Sir J. Baker; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 26*, 1126.

Roberts, Mr. J. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]
- Foreign Office Papers, Advance Copies to the Press—Case of the *Morning Leader*, etc., *June 22*, 783.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
- Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, Welsh Sunday Closing Bill, etc., *June 18*, 321.
- India
  - Budget—Date of Introduction, *June 22*, 784.
  - Famine, *June 26*, 1132.
  - Troops withdrawn from Establishment for Service outside India—Enlarging Establishment, etc., *June 26*, 1131.
- Mineral Rights in Wales, Sale of, Value of Rights, etc., *June 22*, 849.
- Welsh Sunday Closing Bill, Passing into Law this Session, *June 18*, 297.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
- Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 656.
- Dundee University College—Grant-in-aid, etc., *June 15*, 207.
- Great Indian Peninsula Railway Bill—Annuities, *Com.*, *June 19*, 419; *June 21*, 604.
- Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1228, 1242, 1252.

Robson, Mr. W. S. [South Shields]
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *June 25*, 937.

Rochdale Corporation Bill
- *c. Con.** and 3R.* *June 26*, 1108.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 26*, 1028.
- Report from Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills, *June 20*, 505.

Rockcorry Petty Sessions
- Transfer of Licence Granted to Land Agent and Acting Magistrate
  - *Q.* Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1344.

Roe's Patent Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *June 22*, 737.
- 2R.* *June 28*, 1266.
- Petition for Bill—Standing Orders, *June 18*, 250, 267; Examiner's Certificates referred to Standing Orders Committee, 250.
- Standing Orders, *June 26*, 1110.

Rollit, Sir A. K. [Islington, S.]
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1154.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 1003.
- Post Office, Transfer to Mount Pleasant—Re-arrangements, Delays, etc., *June 25*, 1023.

Roman Catholic Procession
- Peckham, *see* that title.

Roman Catholic University, Ireland
- *see* Ireland.

Roodeval
- *see* South African War—Sherwood Foresters.

Ross and Cromarty
- Sheriffship — Mr. W. C. Smith's Parliamentary Candidature, Resigning Sheriffship
  - *Q.* Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 19*, 446.

Rotherham Corporation Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *June 25*, 890.
- Standing Orders, *June 18*, 267.

Round, Mr. J. [Essex, Harwich]
- Ambulance Wagons, *June 19*, 494.

Royal Arms
- Documents demanding Payment of Debts—Imitation of County Court Process Bill, *June 22*, 742.

Royal Artillery
- *see* Army—Artillery.

Royal College of Art
- Instructor and Junior Inspector, Special Qualifications required — Treasury Minute Presented, *June 19*, 412, 432.

Royal Engineers
- *see* Army—Engineers.

Royal Irish Constabulary
- *see* Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Royal Reserve Battalions
- *see* Army.

Rum
- Jamaica—Excise Restrictions, Omission of Reports in Return, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 908.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Oldham]
- South African War
  - Horses—Cost of Transport, *June 25*, 898.
  - Promotions from the Ranks—Regular Forces, *June 22*, 776.

Rural Schools
- Gorst's, Sir J., Statement, *June 14*, 22.

Russell, Gen. F. S. [Cheltenham]
- Army
  - Dogs, Training for Outpost Duty proposed — Employment of Dogs in Continental Armies, *June 18*, 281
  - Horses—Supply of Remounts, etc., *June 19*, 466.
- Boer War, 1881—Issue of Medals, proposed, *June 28*, 1322.
- South African War
  - Death Duties—Remission of Duties to Officers' Widows, *June 18*, 279.
  - Lindley—Disaster to Imperial Yeomanry, etc., *June 19*, 433.
- Vehicle Lights—Side Lights on Covered Vans, *June 18*, 292.
- War Medals — Forwarding deceased Officers' Medals to Relations, *June 21*, 620.

Russell, Mr. T. W.—*Secretary to the Local Government Board* [Tyrone, S.]
- Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 518, 519, 520.
- District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 407.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 934, 964, 985.
- Local Government Provisional Order Bills —Distinctive titles, suggested, *June 19*, 416.
- Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 681, 721, 722; *June 26*, 1198, 1199, 1200.
- Motor Car Speed Regulations, *June 22*, 788.
- Oldham Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1107.

Russell of Killowen, Lord
- Lunacy Administration — St. Pancras Scandal, *June 26*, 1059, 1065, 1066.
- Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Com.*, *June 28*, 1273.

Russia
- Anglo-Russian Relations
  - Concert of the Powers and the Crisis in China
    - *Q.* Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 14*, 14.
- China, Anti-foreign Rising, *see* China.
- Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.
- Turkey and Russia—Railway Concessions in Asia Minor
  - *Q.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 243; *Q.* Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 21*, 627; *June 25*, 906.

Rutherford, Mr. J. [Lancashire, Darwen]
- Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1081.

Sailors
- *see* Seamen.

St. Albans, Bishop of
- Marriage Act Anmendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 26*, 1053.

St. Albans Water Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *June 25*, 875.
- Standing Orders, *June 21*, 573.

St. Andrews University
- Annual Statistical Report Presented, *June 25*, 895; *June 26*, 1030.
- University College of Dundee, Grant-in-aid, etc.
  - Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 196.

St. Davids Railway (Abandonment) Bill
- *c.* *Con.** *June 15*, 130.
  - 3R.* *June 19*, 421.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 19*, 411.
  - 2R.* *June 26*, 1026.
- Standing Orders, *June 25*, 874.

St. George's Barracks
- National Gallery, Dangers from Fire, etc., *see* National Gallery.

St. Helena
- Boer Prisoners—*see* South African War, Prisoners.
- Mails, Delivery of—Delay in forwarding English Mails from Cape Town
  - *Q.* Mr. Bill; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 897.

St. Pancras Lunacy Scandal
- Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 835.
- Debate (Lords), *June 26*, 1059.
- Local Government Board Inquiry
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Burns; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *June 28*, 1339.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 4; *June 15*, 134; *June 18*, 272; *June 19*, 426; *June 20*, 506; *June 21*, 608; *June 22*, 770; *June 25*, 893; *June 26*, 1111; *June 27*, 1206; *June 28*, 1311.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill
Granting Special Facilities for passing into Law this Session, proposed
Q. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 920.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill
c. Com., *June 20*, 570.
Petitions, *June 14*, 5; *June 15*, 134; *June 18*, 273; *June 19*, 427; *June 20*, 506; *June 21*, 608; *June 22*, 771; *June 25*, 893; *June 26*, 1111, 1112; *June 27*, 1206; *June 28*, 1311.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 5; *June 15*, 135; *June 18*, 273; *June 19*, 429; *June 20*, 511; *June 21*, 611; *June 22*, 773; *June 25*, 894; *June 26*, 1112; *June 27*, 1207.

Salford Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 426.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 888.

Salisbury, Marquess of—*Premier and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*
Burial Authorities (Cremation) Bill, *Com.*, *June 28*, 1269.
China
Anti-Foreign Rising, *June 18*, 259.
Macdonald, Sir C., Position of, *June 28*, 1268.
Cromwell Statue, Erection of within the Precincts of the Palace of Westminster without the consent of Parliament, *June 21*, 592.
Military Lands Bill, *Com.*, *June 21*, 582.
Shops, Hours of Labour in—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, *June 21*, 601.
Uganda Railway Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 583, 587, 588.

Salisbury Plain Manœuvres
Canteen Arrangements—Restricting to Army Contractors
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 622.
Manchester Volunteers — Commissariat Breakdown
Qs. Mr. Holland, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 621.

almon Fisheries
Sale of Crown Rights
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 856.
Scotland—Report Presented, *June 14*, 8; *June 18*, 255.

Samuel, Mr. J. [Stockton]
Burial Grounds Bill, *Con.*, *June 18*, 399.
District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 407.
Ecclesiastical Amendment (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *June 18*, 404.

Samuel, Messrs.
Army Contractors—Unsatisfactory Quality of Boots
O. Mr. Channing, *June 22*, 867.

Sandhurst Military College
Fees for Auxiliary Officers' Sons
Q. Sir J. Woodhouse; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1123.

Sandys, Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]
Peckham Disturbance—Roman Catholic Open-air Procession, etc., *June 18*, 292.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1404.

Savings Banks
see titles Post Office Savings Banks and Trustee Savings Banks.

Savings Banks and Friendly Societies
Accounts Presented, *June 27*, 1208; *June 28*, 1268.

Scarborough Corporation Bill
*c. Rep.** *June 27*, 1264.

School Board Elections (London) Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 5.

School Boards
Religious Instruction in Schools, Ritualism, etc.
Smith, Mr. S., on, *June 14*, 56—Sir J. Gorst's Reply, 58.

School Gardens
Gorst's, Sir J., Statement, *June 14*, 33.

School Inspectors
see Education.

Schools
see Education.

Schreiner Ministry
see Cape Colony—Ministry.

Science and Art
- Dublin Science College, *see* Dublin.
- Science Teachers, Ireland — Summer Classes, Fee Grievance, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 28*, 1350.
- Union of the Education and Science and Art Departments, *see* Secondary Education Bill.

Scientific Investigations
- Vote for, *June 15*, 190—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Scotland
- *Secretary*—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
- *Lord Advocate*—Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.
- Barlinnie Prison—Payment of Fines by Prisoners
  - *Q.* Sir C. Cameron ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 26*, 1135.
- Bills relating to Scotland, *see* their titles.
- Catterline Episcopal School—Dismissal of Head Mistress, Investigation proposed
  - *Q.* Mr. Crombie ; *A.* Mr. H. Fisher, *June 14*, 15.
- Channel Fleet, Visit to Shetland proposed
  - *Q.* Sir L. Lyell ; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 18*, 285.
- Dundee University College—Grant-in-aid, etc.
  - Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 196.
- Edinburgh Post Office—Delay in Revision of Sorting Branch
  - *Q.* Mr. Dewar ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 19*, 445.
- Education—*for* collective heading, *see* Education.
- Fishery Board
  - Annual Report Presented, *June 14*, 8 ; *June 18*, 255 ; *June 28*, 1312.
  - Scientific Investigations—Report Presented, *June 18*, 255.
- Greenock Board School—Providing Prizes out of School Fund
  - *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 28*, 1343.
- Hebrides, Naval Recruiting—Training Ship for Portree, proposed
  - *Q.* Mr. Hedderwick ; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 913.
- Local Authorities, Allocation and Application of Technical Education Funds, etc.—Return Ordered, *June 19*, 432.
- Lunacy—Rules for Government of Kirklands Asylum Presented, *June 28*, 1267, 1312.
- Piershill Barracks — Sanitary Condition, etc.
  - *Os.* Dr. Farquharson, Mr. J. P. Williams, Mr. Allan, *June 19*, 498, 500.
- Prisons
  - Dietaries, Rule Presented, *June 14*, 8 ; *June 18*, 257.

Scotland—*cont.*
- Prisons—*cont.*
  - Report of Departmental Committee Presented, *June 19*, 412, 431.
- St. Andrews University—Annual Statistical Report Presented, *June 25*, 895 ; *June 26*, 1030.
- Salmon Fisheries
  - Report Presented, *June 14*, 8 ; *June 18*, 255.
  - Sale of Crown Rights
    - Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 856.
- Sheriffship of Ross and Cromarty—Mr. W. C. Smith's Parliamentary Candidature, Resigning Sheriffship
  - *Q.* Sir C. Cameron ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 19*, 446.
- Stornoway Secondary Education School, Erection of—Withdrawing Grants from Relief of Rates
  - *Q.* Mr. Hedderwick ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 25*, 912.
- Training Colleges, *see* that title.
- Trawling in Loch Fyne, Suppression of—Inadequacy of the "Daisy"
  - *Q.* Sir C. Cameron ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 25*, 913.
- Whisky in Bond—Return Ordered, *June 19*, 432.

Scottish American Investment Company, Limited, Bill
- c. 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
  - *Rep.** *June 22*, 767.

Sea Fish Life
- Study of—Grant-in-aid to the Marine Biological Association
  - *Os.* Mr. Bowles, Mr. Hanbury, *June 15*, 190, 192.

Sea Fisheries Regulations (Scotland) Act (1895) Amendment Bill
- Petitions, *June 19*, 429.

Seamen, Merchant Service
- Fund Pensions, Vote for, *June 19*, 504.
- Marriages — Marriage Act Amendment Bill, *June 18*, 262.

Seamen, Naval
- Sailors on Active Service—Petitions for Legislation, *June 18*, 274 ; *June 19*, 429.
- Training of Seamen — Dismantling of Sailing Ships, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1128.
- Workmen's Compensation Act Extension
  - *Q.* Mr. M'Kenna ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 279 ; *Q.* Col. Pryce-Jones ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 920.

Searle, Warder
- Pension, Increase of, proposed
  - *Q.* Mr. Cornwallis ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1132.

Secondary Education
see Education.

Secondary Education Bill
l. Intro. and 1R.* *June 26*, 1031, 1044.

Secondary Education Bill
Devonshire's, Duke of, Statement, *June 26*, 1031.
Charity Commissioners, 1035.
Denominational Question, 1041.
Dual Organisation, 1037.
Local Authorities, Powers of, etc., 1040.
Officials, 1037.
Science Schools, 1035.
Science and Art Departments, Abolition of, 1038.
Secondary Schools, 1033.
Technology, Literary and Scientific Instruction, 1037.

Secondary Education Schools
Stornoway, *see* that title.

Secret Commissions
Prevention of Corruption Bill, *see* that title.

Seely, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
Royal Reserve Battalions—Good Conduct Badges and Rate of Pay, etc., *June 26*, 1126.

Selection, Committee of
see Committees.

Separation Allowance
see Army.

Seymour, Admiral
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.

Shanghai
see China.

Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill
Order referring Bill to Special Committee discharged, *June 21*, 603.

Shaw, Mr. C. E. [Stafford]
Artillery and Engineers Promotion Regulations, *June 19*, 436.
Militia Officers' leave of absence, *June 19*, 438.

Shaw, Mr. T. [Hawick Burghs]
Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, 3R., *June 21*, 663.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 28*, 1425.

Sheffield
University College—Grant-in-aid, etc.
O. Mr. S. Wortley, *June 15*, 210.

Sheffield Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. 1R.* *June 19*, 426.
Standing Orders, *June 25*, 888.

Sheffield District Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
Rep. *June 25*, 891.

Sheriffs
Scotland—Ross and Cromarty Sheriffship, Mr. Smith's Parliamentary Candidature
Q. Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 19*, 446.

Sherwood Foresters Militia
see South African War.

Shetland
Channel Fleet, Visit to Shetland proposed —Visits from German Ships, etc.
Q. Sir L. Lyell; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 18*, 285.

Shipbuilding for the Navy
see Navy.

Shipping
see Merchant Shipping.

Shop Hours Act Amendment Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *June 27*, 1262.
Petitions, *June 20*, 511.

Shops
Hours of Labour—Committee of Inquiry
Os. Lord Avebury, Marquess of Salisbury, *June 21*, 601.

Shorthand
Elementary Schools—Requirements
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *June 28*, 1338.

Signalling Officers
South African War—Increase of Pay, proposed
Q. Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 619.

Simeon, Sir J. S. B. [Southampton]
Volunteer Chaplains—Capitation Grant, etc., *June 25*, 901.

Simmons, Case of
Brighton Telegraphist—Efficiency Barrier
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 28*, 1341.

Sinclair, Capt. J. [Forfar]
Army Horses—Cost of Horses sent to South Africa, Cost of Transport, etc., *June 19*, 467.
Australian Colonies granting Bounties on Commodities, *June 25*, 909.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 565, 567, 568.

Sixtieth Rifles
Farquhar's Farm Engagement—Field-State
Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 278.

Slave Trade
Morocco, Public Sale of Slaves—European Intervention proposed
Q. Mr. Hazell ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 18*, 288.
Zanzibar—Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 216—(*Division : A. 39 ; N. 94.*)

Slough Railway Accident
Official Report—Number of Trains in consequence of the Windsor Races, etc.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 21*, 632.

Small Tenements Recovery Act, 1838
Summary Powers of Eviction—Communication to London Magistrates
Q. Mr. Pickersgill ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 28*, 1337.

Smith, Mr. P. [Lanark, Partick]
Midwives Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1259.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1200.

Smith, Mr. S. [Flintshire]
Education—Code of 1900, Ritualistic Teaching in Church and Board Schools, etc., *June 14*, 47, 61, 62.
Post Office Employees and Sunday Duty—Compulsory Duty, *June 18*, 294.

Smith, Mr. W. C.
Parliamentary Candidate — Resigning Sheriffship of Ross and Cromarty
Q. Sir C. Cameron ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 19*, 446.

Smyrna and District
Trade Report Presented, *June 26*, 1029.

Soames, Mr. A. W. [Norfolk, S.]
Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreak in Norfolk, Restrictions on Movement of Cattle, etc., *June 22*, 811.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *June 20*, 567.

Soldiers
Dependent Relatives—Reservists Recalled to the Colours, Separation Allowance for Mothers, etc.
Os. Mr. Galloway, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 474, 478.
Disabled Soldiers, State Provision for—Extension of Powers of Chelsea Commissioners
Qs. Sir J. Leng, Sir J. Kennaway ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 280.
Heat Casualties during Aldershot Manœuvres, *see* Aldershot.
Invalid Soldiers returning from South Africa—Hospital Accommodation, Case of Private Mitchell
Qs. Sir E. Gourley, Mr. Marks ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 616.
Soldiers on Active Service—Petitions for Legislation, *June 18*, 274 ; *June 19*, 429.
Workmen's Compensation Act Extension
Q. Mr. M'Kenna ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 279 ; *Q.* Col. Pryce-Jones ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 920.

Solicitors
Colonial Solicitors—Admission to Supreme Courts in United Kingdom, Colonial Solicitors Bill, *June 26*, 1279.

Sonora State
Trade Report Presented, *June 28*, 1267.

Soudan
British Trade with—Statistics
Q. Mr. Hedderwick ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 18*, 289.

South African War
Ambulance Wagons
Os. Mr. Round, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 494, 495.
Bloemfontein Hospital Arrangements, *see* sub-heading Medical Arrangements.
Boots supplied to Troops—Unsatisfactory quality, Messrs. Samuel's and Indian Contracts
Os. Mr. Channing, Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 866, 870.
Brigade Signalling Officers—Increase of Pay, proposed
Q. Mr. Hudson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 619.
British Forces—Number landed in South Africa between Aug. 1, 1899, and May 31, 1900
Q. Mr. J. Ellis ; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 434.
Cables, *see* sub-heading Telegrams.
Cape Colony
Mails, *see* that sub-heading.
Rebels, *see* that sub-heading.
Casualties
Sherwood Foresters Militia — Delay in publishing List
Q. Mr. Yoxall ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 278.

[*cont.*

South African War—*cont.*
- Casualties—*cont.*
  - War Office—Attendance of Responsible Officer at an early hour in the day
    - *Q.* Mr. Bartley; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 435.
- Christmas Presents for Officers and Soldiers, Non-delivery of
  - *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 435.
- Colonial Contingents
  - Visit of Representatives to England after the War
    - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 775.
  - Total number landed in South Africa, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1320.
- Convoy, Capture of—Officer making good
  - *Q.* Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 433.
- Death Duties—Remission of Duties to Officers' Widows
  - *Q.* Gen. Russell; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach, *June 18*, 279.
- Derbyshire, 4th, *see* sub-heading Sherwood Foresters.
- Duke of Edinburgh's Volunteer Rifles—Mr. Logan's gift of Maxim Gun, etc.
  - *Q.* Sir W. Lawson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 899.
- Enteric Fever, Inoculation against
  - Results and Statistics
    - *Qs.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Wason, Col. W. Murray; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1116; *Q.* Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1321.
  - Troops under Orders for South Africa—Inoculating
    - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1117.
- Farquhar's Farm Engagement — Field-State of 60th Rifles
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 278.
- Fenian Prisoners, *see* sub-heading Martial Law.
- Field Service Equipment, Loss of—Compensation
  - Officer making good Loss of Convoy, etc.
    - *Q.* Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 433.
- Forage—Hay Purchased Abroad, etc.
  - *Os.* Mr. Strachey, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 476, 478
- Gifts for the Troops
  - Non-delivery of Parcels, etc., *see* sub-heading Parcels.
- Horses
  - Cost of Transport—Average Cost per Horse
    - *Q.* Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 898.

South African War—*cont.*
- Horses—*cont.*
  - Number of Horses Shipped to South Africa, Cost per head, etc.
    - *O.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 457.
  - Supply of, Suitability of Horses Purchased, etc.
    - Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 449.
- Hospitals, *see* sub-heading Medical Arrangements, etc.
- Invalided Soldiers incapable of Earning Livelihood, Provision for—Extension of Powers of Chelsea Commissioners
  - *Qs.* Sir J. Leng, Sir J. Kennaway; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 280.
- Invalided Soldiers returning Home, Hospital Accommodation — Case of Private Mitchell
  - *Qs.* Sir E. Gourley, Mr. Marks; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 616.
- Ladysmith, Siege of
  - Disappearance of Stores from the Hospital — Records of Court-martial
    - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 140.
  - Food Supplied from Military Stores—Imperial Government's Claim on Mayor
    - *Q.* Mr. Bartley; *A.* Mr. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 141; *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 277.
  - White's, Sir G., Despatches—Publication of
    - *Q.* Mr. Lafone; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 141.
- Lindley—Disaster to Imperial Yeomanry, etc.
  - Casualty List, Publication of
    - *Q.* Mr. Butcher; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 899.
  - Wounded Yeomanry, Inquiry into Causes of Disaster, etc.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Butcher, Gen. Russell; *As.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 433.
- Mafeking, Siege of
  - Fenians, *see* sub-heading Martial Law.
- Mails, Delivery of in St. Helena—Delay in forwarding English Mails from Cape Town
  - *Q.* Mr. Bill; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 897.
- Martial Law, Administration
  - Circular issued by Colonial Office in 1867—Administration based on
    - *O.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1116.
  - Fenians under Arrest, alleged—Case of Mr. Quinlan, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 898.
  - Number of Persons arrested and discharged — Intervention of Supreme Court, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 434; *Q.* Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Wyndham *June 26*, 1115.

South African War—*cont.*
- Martial Law, Administration—*cont.*
  - Rebels in Cape Colony, *see* that sub-heading.
- Medals—Design, etc.
  - References to in Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 838.
- Medical Arrangements at Bloemfontein—Disorganisation and Inefficiency of Military Hospitals, Mr. Burdett-Coutts's Allegations
  - Inquiry
    - *Qs.* Mr. Dillon, Mr. Paulton, Col. Lockwood, Capt. Norton, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 28*, 1313, 1315.
  - Letters to *The Times* previous to May 29 — Communicating to the War Office
    - *Q.* Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1313, 1314.
  - Papers
    - *Q.* Mr. J. Pease; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 28*, 1432.
    - Telegrams Presented, *June 28*, 1267, 1312
  - Roberts's, Lord, Statement
    - *O.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 28*, 1315.
    - Field Hospitals outside Bloemfontein
      - *Q.* Mr. Burdett-Coutts; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 28*, 1318.
- Orange Free State Annexation — Lord Roberts's Proclamation—Treatment of Armed Inhabitants as Rebels
  - *Q.* Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 21*, 615; *Q.* Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 28*, 1322.
- Outrages on Boer Women and Children by British Troops—Boer Allegations
  - *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 141.
- Parcels—Non-delivery of Christmas Presents
  - *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 436.
- Prayers—Form of Intercessory Prayer—Petition from Church of England Union of New South Wales, *June 15*, 135.
- Pretoria Relief Celebrations at Downpatrick—Action of the Police, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 915.
- Prisoners
  - Boer Prisoners at St. Helena
    - Presents for Prisoners
      - *Q.* Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 897.
    - Treatment of British Troops and Boer Prisoners — Selling Tobacco free of Duty to Prisoners, etc.
      - *Q.* Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 25*, 896.

South African War—*cont.*
- Prisoners—*cont.*
  - British Prisoners, Release of
    - Court of Inquiry into Circumstances leading to Surrender, etc.
      - *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1320.
    - Publication of Names
      - *Q.* Mr. Palmer; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 776.
- Promotions from the Ranks
  - Conditions
    - *Q.* Sir J. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 619.
  - Number of Men promoted from Ranks of Regular Forces, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 776.
- Rebels in Cape Colony, Treatment of—Minute of Cape Ministry
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 14*, 10; *June 21*, 615; *June 26*, 1115.
- Relief Funds, *see* title War Relief Funds.
- Reservists
  - Pensions—Counting Service in Sections A, B, C, Serving on to complete twenty-one years' Service, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. M'Kenna; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 777.
  - Recalled to the Colours—Separation allowance for mothers
    - *Os.* Mr. Galloway, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 474, 478.
  - Situations kept open—Reservists first Soldiers to be sent home on conclusion of Hostilities
    - *Q.* Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 776.
- Rifles and Ammunition taken from the Boers—Utilising for the benefit of Rifle Clubs, proposed
  - *O.* Capt. Norton, *June 19*, 494.
- Settlement of Soldiers in South Africa after the War
  - Formation of Organisation in South Africa
    - *Q.* Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 18*, 279.
  - Grants to Soldiers—Skilled Artisans Serving as Reservists
    - *Q.* Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 777.
- Sherwood Foresters — Roodeval Engagement
  - Capture of Militia, Telegraphic Communications
    - *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1321.
  - Delay in publishing Casualty List
    - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 278.
- Sick and Wounded, *see* sub-heading Medical Arrangements, etc.
- Signalling Officers, *see* sub-heading Brigade Signalling Officers.

[*cont.*

South African War—*cont.*
Soldiers and Sailors on Active Service—Petitions for Legislation, *June 18*, 274; *June 19*, 429.
Stores, Disappearance of, from Hospital at Ladysmith, *see* sub-heading Ladysmith.
Telegrams—Code and Cypher Commercial Telegrams—Removal of Restrictions
Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 436.
Typhoid Fever, *see* sub-heading Enteric.
Volunteers, *see* that title.
Wagons—Lighter Wagons Desirable
Os. Mr. Warner, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 461, 468.
War Relief Funds, *see* that title.
Yeomanry—Disaster at Lindley, *see* sub-heading Lindley.

South Coast Fisheries
Trawling — Depredations by Foreign Trawlers, Representations to Foreign Governments, etc.
Qs. Sir C. Gull, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 19*, 444.

South Eastern Metropolitan Tramways Bill
l. 2R.* *June 19*, 410.

South Eastern Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *June 15*, 131.
Rep. *June 22*, 768.

South Eastern and Chatham Railway
Luggage—Excess Charges
Q. Sir C. Gull; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 18*, 290.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 21*, 574.
3R.* *June 25*, 876.
c. 1R.* *June 25*, 892.

South Kensington Museum
Victoria and Albert Museum, *see* that title.

South Lancashire Tramways Bill
l. 2R.* *June 18*, 251.

South Metropolitan Gas Bill
c. *Con.* *June 14*, 3.
3R.* *June 18*, 269.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737, 738; *June 26*, 1025.

South Shields Corporation Bill
l. *Rep.* *June 19*, 410.
3R.* *June 26*, 1027.
c. 1R.* *June 26*, 1111.

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill
c. 2R.* *June 25*, 890.
Standing Orders, *June 18*, 267.

Southall Schools
Expenditure on—Increased Accommodation, Cost per head per Child
Q. Mr. Spicer; *A.* Mr. Chaplin *June 28*, 1338.

Southport Extension and Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *June 18*, 251.
c. Lords Amendts.* *June 25*, 889.

Southport Water Bill
l. 3R.* *June 18*, 251.
Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad Bill
c. 3R.* *June 14*, 130.
l. 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

Souttar, Mr. R. [Dumfriesshire]
Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, *June 18*, 317.

Spain
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254, 256.

Speaker (Rt. Hon. W. C. Gully)
Bills
Amendments to Bills—Discussing all the Amendments on the Paper upon the Motion that the Bill be Considered, *June 20*, 542.
Omitting words in putting the Question, *June 27*, 1248.
Consideration and Third Reading Stages—Discussing both stages on same day, *June 20*, 522.
Opposition to Consideration of Bill—Placing Notice of Motion on the Paper not sufficient to secure delay, *June 15*, 129.
Blocking Notices—Notice of Motion on the Paper raising the same Question, *June 28*, 1313.
Business of the House—Appropriation of Private Members' Days, Amendments to Motion, *June 18*, 316.
Irrelevant Observations, *June 25*, 886, 887; *June 28*, 1404.
Questions—Debating Answers to Questions, *June 15*, 156.

Spencer, Earl
Naval Reserve (Mobilisation) Bill, 2R., *June 19*, 413; *Com.*, *June 25*, 885.

Spicer, Mr. A. [Monmouth Boroughs]
Southall Schools, Expenditure on—Increased Accommodation, etc., *June 28*, 1338.

Spinks, W.
Case of—Walsingham Petty Sessions
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1134.

Staffordshire
Clerk of the Peace—Increase of Pay and Allowance
Q. Mr. Coghill; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 21*, 630.

Standing Committees
see Committees.

Standing Orders
Committee Reports, *June 22*, 738; *June 26*, 1110.
Select Committee Quorum—Standing Orders Suspended, *June 22*, 765.

Stanhope, Earl of
Post Office, Transfer to Mount Pleasant—Postal Arrangements, Delays, etc., *June 21*, 598.

Stationery and Printing
Vote for, *June 22*, 841—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Board of Trade—Abstractors' retaining Allowance upon Promotion, *June 28*, 1342.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 932, 983, 1012, 1014.
Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 713.
Post Office Employees
  Central Telegraph Office—Punishment of Clerks for Exceeding Dinner Interval, etc., *June 22*, 786.
  Counter Clerks and Telegraphists in London—Relief during Tea-time, proposed, *June 22*, 786.
  W. C. D. Office Auxiliary Postmen and the Tweedmouth Report, *June 22*, 785.

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *June 27*, 1262.

Steamship Communication, Ireland
Foynes and Kilrush
Q. Mr. O'Keeffe; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1346.

Stevenson, Mr. F. S. [Suffolk, Eye]
Ashanti Rising—Investment of Coomassie, Names of Europeans, etc., *June 19*, 443.
Macedonia, Northern—Increase of British Consular Staff, proposed, *June 28*, 1334.

Stewart, Sir M. [Kirkcudbright]
Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill, 3R., *June 18*, 385.

Stockport Corporation Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.
c. Lords Amendts.* *June 25*, 889.

Stornoway
Secondary Education School, Erection of—Withdrawing Grants from Relief of Rates for Education Purposes
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 25*, 912.

Strachey, Mr. E. [Somerset, S.]
Army Forage—Purchase of Hay in Argentina, etc., *June 19*, 476, 478.
Oldham Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1106.
Swine Fever—Restrictions on Movement of Swine, etc., *June 22*, 805.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 525, 550; *June 27*, 1223.

Strangford Lough Lighthouses
Casualties and Wrecks, List of, etc.
Q. Mr. Blakiston-Houston; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 26*, 1136.
Refusal of Irish Lights Commission to provide Light
Q. Mr. H. C. Richards; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 14*, 16.

Stuart, Mr. J. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
Dundee University College—Grant-in-aid, etc., *June 15*, 196, 209.
Education—Poor Law Schools, Education Department Control, etc., *June 14*, 70.
Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 675.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 941, 964, 984, 997, 1005.

Suffolk
Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreak, Restrictions on Movement of Cattle, etc.
Debate in Committee of Supply, *June 22*, 805.

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 6; *June 15*, 136; *June 18*, 274; *June 19*, 429; *June 20*, 511; *June 21*, 611; *June 22*, 773; *June 25*, 894; *June 26*, 1112, 1113; *June 27*, 1207; *June 28*, 1311.

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act (1881) Amendment Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 6; *June 15*, 136; *June 18*, 274; *June 19*, 431; *June 20*, 515; *June 21*, 613; *June 22*, 774; *June 25*, 894; *June 26*, 1113; *June 27*, 1208; *June 28*, 1312.

Sunday Duty in the Post Office
see Post Office Employees.

Sunstroke
Deaths from, during Aldershot Manœuvres, *see* Aldershot—Heat Casualties.

Superannuation
Civil Service, *see* that title.
Local Authorities Officers' Superannuation Bill, *see* that title.
Teachers in Isle of Man and Channel Islands—Legislation
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 21*, 630.

Supply
Army Estimates, *see* that title.
Civil Service Estimates
Agriculture, Board of—£11,028, *Com.*, *June 22*, 805; *Rep.* June 25*, 1021.
British Museum and Natural History Museum—£86,280; *Com.*, *June 15*, 179; *Rep.* June 18*, 404.
British Protectorates in Uganda and in Central and East Africa—£167,186, *Com.*, *June 15*, 244; *Rep.* June 18*, 406.
Charity Commission—£23,036, *Com.*, *June 15*, 820; *Rep.* June 25*, 1021.
Colonial Services—£256,955, *Com.*, *June 15*, 245; *Rep.* June 18*, 406.
Cyprus (Grant-in-aid)—£1,000, *Com.*, *June 15*, 245; *Rep.* June 18*, 406.
Education—£5,585,099; *Com.*, *June 14*, 20; *June 15*, 159; *Rep.* June 18*, 404.
Embassies and Missions Abroad—£255,384; *Com.*, *June 15*, 211; *Rep.** 406.
Irish Votes—Local Government Board—£32,339; *Rep.* June 25*, 1023.
London University—£5, *Com.*, *June 15*, 211; *Rep.* June 18*, 405.
Lunacy Commissioners, England—£9,778, *Com.*, *June 22*, 833; *Rep.* June 25*, 1021.
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions—£1,800, *Com.* June 19*, 504; *Rep.* June 22*, 872.
Mint, Including Coinage—£67, *June 22*, 838; *Rep.* June 25*, 1022.
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances—£725, *Com.* June 19*, 504; *Rep.* June 22*, 872.
Miscellaneous Expenses—£1,370, *Com.* June 19*, 504; *Rep.* June 22*, 872.
National Debt Office—£8,097, *Com.* June 22*, 839; *Rep.* June 25*, 1022.
National Gallery—£8,374, *Com.*, *June 15*, 190; *Rep.* June 18*, 405.

Supply—*cont.*
Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
National Portrait Gallery—£2,520, *Com.*, *June 15*, 190; *Rep.* June 18*, 405.
Paris Exhibition—£1,000, *Com.* June 19*, 504; *Rep.* June 22*, 872.
Printing and Stationery—£350,060, *Com.*, *June 22*, 841; *Rep.* June 25*, 1022.
Privy Council Office—£7,340, *Com.*, *June 22*, 803; *Rep.* June 25*, 1021.
Public Works Loan Commission—£15, *Com.*, *June 22*, 840; *Rep.* June 25*, 1022.
Record Office—£12,838, *Com.*, *June 22*, 839; *Rep.* June 25*, 1022.
Registrar General's Office, England—£23,702, *Com.*, *June 22*, 840; *Rep.* June 25*, 1022.
Scientific Investigations—£35,724, *Com.*, *June 15*, 190; *Rep.* June 18*, 405.
Subsidies to Telegraph Companies—£14,350, *Com.*, *June 15*, 247; *Rep.* June 18*, 406.
Superannuation, Compassionate Allowances, etc., awarded by the Treasury, £284,058, *Com.* June 19*, 504; *Rep.* June 22*, 871.
Temporary Commissions—£9,452, *Com.* June 19*, 504; *Rep.* June 22*, 872.
Treasury and Subordinate Departments—£51,299, *Com.*, *June 22*, 795; *Rep.* June 25*, 1021.
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales—£67,500, *Com.*, *June 15*, 190; *Rep.* June 18*, 405.
Wallace Collection—£4,967, *Com.*, *June 15*, 190; *Rep.* June 18*, 405.
Woods, Forests and Land Revenues of the Crown—£13,439, *Com.*, *June 22*, 845.
(*for* subjects discussed in Com. of Supply, *see* their titles.)

Surveys
Admiralty Surveys—Hydrographer's Report Presented, *June 18*, 276; *June 21*, 575.

Swatow
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Swine Fever
Reduction in Number of Outbreaks, etc.
O. Mr. Long, *June 22*, 811.
Restrictions on movements of Swine, etc.
O. Mr. Strachey, *June 22*, 805.

Switzerland
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Taff Vale Railway Bill
c. *Rep.* June 22*, 768.
Con. June 26*, 1108.

Taganrog
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

Ta-ku
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]
Education—Training Colleges, etc., *June 14*, 69.

Taunton Corporation Bill
c. *Rep.* June 27*, 1264.

Teachers
see Education—Pupil Teachers, etc.

Technical Instruction Act, 1889
Glamorgan, County of—Minutes sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8, Presented, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 255.
Warwick, County of—Minutes sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8, Presented, *June 14*, 9; *June 18*, 255.

Technical and Secondary Education
see Education.

Teinds (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *June 15*, 136; *June 19*, 431; *June 21*, 613.

Telegrams
South African War, *see* that title.

Telegraph Service
National Telephone Co.—Delivery of Telegrams over Company's Wires, Instructions to Postmasters
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 911.

Telegraph Wires
Underground Wires—London to Birmingham Experiment, Extension to the North, proposed
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 18*, 293.

Telegraphists
Brighton—Efficiency Barrier, Case of Simmons
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 28*, 1341.
Central Telegraph Office, London—Punishment of Clerks for exceeding Dinner Interval, etc.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 22*, 786.
Liverpool
Inspectors of Messengers Performing Telegraphists' Duties
Q. Mr. T. P. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 28*, 1341.

Telegraphists—*cont.*
Liverpool—*cont.*
Number of Temporary Telegraphists, etc.
Q. Mr. T. P. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 28*, 1340.
Relief during Tea-time, proposed
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 22*, 786.

Telephone Companies
Subsidies, Vote for, *June 15*, 247.

Telephone Service
National Telephone Company, *see* that title.

Temperance Reform Threefold Option (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *June 14*, 6; *June 21*, 613; *June 25*, 894.

Temporary Commissions
Vote for, *June 19*, 504.

Tenants
Evictions, *see* that title.

"Terrible," H.M.S.
Water-tube Boilers—Speed of Voyage from Hong Kong to Ta-ku
Qs. Sir F. Flannery, Mr. Allan; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *June 28*, 1328.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Companies Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 14*, 17.
Private Bill Committees—Selection of Members, etc., *June 25*, 919.

Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 935.

Thring, Lord
Military Drill in Schools, etc., *June 28*, 1295.

Tientsin
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.

Tiflis
British Consulate at
Qs. Mr. Elliot, Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 243.

Tithe Rent-charge, Ireland
Arrears, Recovery of
Proceedings for Recovery
Q. Mr. A. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 28*, 1347.
Receivers, Appointment of, Cost of Proceedings, Receivers' Fees, etc.—Number of Cases in respect of Sums under £10, etc.
Qs. Mr. A. O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 28*, 1347, 1348.

[*cont.*

Tithe Rent-charge, Ireland—*cont.*

Redemption—Costs and Expenses, etc.
Q. Mr. A. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 28*, 1349.

Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill
l. 2R., *June 28*, 1354.

Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill
Debate on Second Reading (Lords), *June 28*, 1354.

Act of 1838, 1355, 1370, 1405.

Basis of Tithe Rent-charge, Land or Rent, 1355, 1358, 1365, 1394, 1424, 1427.

Church Fund, Effect of the Bill on, etc., 1359, 1363, 1366, 1368, 1374, 1377, 1380, 1388, 1391, 1395, 1407, 1414, 1424, 1426.

Clause 32 of Irish Church Act—Settlement of 1869-72, 1359, 1361, 1371, 1373, 1426.

Corn Averages, Publication in the *Dublin Gazette*, Decision of Appeal Court, etc., 1355, 1356, 1384, 1393, 1401, 1417.

Department of Agriculture, 1364, 1387.

Ecclesiastical Tithes
Annuities, Reduction in period for Redemption, etc., 1359, 1371, 1374, 1376, 1378, 1394, 1402, 1406, 1409, 1416, 1419, 1425.
Poor Rate, Deduction of, from Tithe Rent-charge, 1359.
Right of Redemption to be withdrawn in future except in transactions under Land Purchase Acts, 1359.
Unredeemed Tithes, restoring variability to, 1359, 1361, 1378.

Financial Effects of the Bill, 1367, 1418.

Irish National Teachers' Pension Fund, 1382.

Landlords' Grievance, 1361, 1366, 1369, 1378, 1381, 1393, 1395, 1398, 1401, 1404, 1411, 1415, 1418.

Leinster and Munster, Average Areas under Wheat and Oats, 1358.

Payment of Lay Tithes
Revision of Charge, Procedure, etc., 1355, 1366, 1384, 1407, 1419.
Variation of Value, Adjustment, etc., 1354, 1357, 1373, 1411, 1417, 1419, 1423, 1427.

Rents, 1361, 1365, 1370, 1381, 1397, 1405, 1423, 1427.

Settlement of 1869-72, *see* sub-heading Clause 32 of Irish Church Act.

Tenants' Grievance, 1370, 1380, 1385, 1403.

Tithe Lessees and Middlemen, 1381, 1412, 1424.

Wheat and Oats, Statistics, 1357, 1361, 1381, 1397, 1415, 1422.

Tomlinson, Mr. W. E. M. [Preston]

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 521.

Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1200.

Rifle Clubs—Formation of Special Department proposed, *June 26*, 1124.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 537, 546.

Tonga

British Protectorate, Proclamation of—Mr. B. Thomson's Mission, etc.
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 152.

Tottenham Urban District Council Bill
*c. Rep.** *June 22*, 768.

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill

c. Report from Standing Committee on Law, *June 22*, 794.
*Con.** and 3R.* *June 28*, 1431.

Petitions, *June 14*, 6; *June 15*, 136.

Trade, Board of

President—Rt. Hon. C. T. Ritchie.

Abstractors, Promotion of—Retention of Personal Allowance
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 28*, 1342.

Reports, *see* their titles.

Sanitary Surveyor — Superannuation, Special Qualifications required, etc., Treasury Minute Presented, *June 15*, 138; *June 18*, 257.

Trade Marks

Foreign Goods imported, bearing names of British Firms and English Words
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 25*, 910.

Trade Reports Presented

Annual Series, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 254, 256, 275; *June 25*, 895; *June 26*, 1029; *June 28*, 1267, 1312.

Miscellaneous Series, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 254; *June 21*, 576, 614; *June 25*, 895; *June 26*, 1029; *June 28*, 1267, 1312.

(*for* names of Countries, *see* their titles.)

Trade and Commerce

China, British Trade with, *see* China.

Germany *v.* Great Britain, *see* Germany—Trade and Commerce.

Soudan, British Trade with—Statistics
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *June 18*, 289.

Training Colleges

Conditions for the Admission of Teachers—Nonconformist Grievance, etc.
Debate in Committee of Supply, *June 14*, 53; *June 15*, 160.

[*cont.*

Training Colleges—*cont.*
Gorst's, Sir J., Statement, *June 14*, 24.
Report for 1899 Presented, *June 21*, 575, 614.
Scotland
Admission, Qualifications—Queen's Scholarship Candidates' Grievance
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 21*, 632.
Trained Teachers—Inadequate Supply
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 21*, 631.
(*see also* Education—Teachers.)

Training Ships
Portree—Stationing Ship at Portree, proposed
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 913.

Training Squadron
Dismantling of Sailing Ships—Training of Seamen, etc.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 26*, 1128.

Tramways
Bills relating to, *see* their titles.

Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
c. 2R., *June 26*, 1204.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
l. Committed to Committee of the whole House, *June 18*, 253.
Com. June 25*, 876.
Rep. June 26*, 1028.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
l. Committed, *June 18*, 253.
Report from Committee of Selection, *June 22*, 739.
Report from Select Committee, *June 28*, 1265.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill
l. Committed, *June 18*, 253.
Report from Committee of Selection, *June 22*, 739.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill
l. Committed, *June 18*, 253.
Report from Committee of Selection, *June 22*, 739.

Transport Service
Horses—Transport of Horses to South Africa, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 19*, 449.

Transport Service—*cont.*
Horses, Cost of Transport—Average Cost per Horse
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 898.

Transport and Remounts
Vote for, *June 19*, 449—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Transvaal
Jameson Raid Indemnity—Great Britain's Claim by Right of Conquest
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 142.
Miners—Return of Miners, etc., to the Transvaal—Sir A. Milner's Warning
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 28*, 1323.
Penny Postage, Extending to the Transvaal
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 620.
War, *see* South African War.
War of 1881—Medals
Q. General Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1322.

Travers' Foundation
Income and Expenditure—Statement Presented, *June 21*, 576, 614.

Trawling
British South Coast Fisheries—Depredations by Foreign Trawlers, Representations to Foreign Governments, etc.
Qs. Sir C. Gull, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 19*, 444.
Ireland
Ardglass Herring Fishery, Decrease in—Illegal Trawling, etc.
Qs. Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 25*, 917.
Kerry Mackerel Fisheries—Destruction of Nets
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *June 25*, 918; *June 28*, 1349.
Scotland—Loch Fyne—Suppression of Illegal Fishing, Inadequacy of the "Daisy," etc.
Q. Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 25*, 913.

Treasure Trove
Cardiff—Offer of Treasure for Purchase to British Museum, etc.
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 19*, 448.
Irish Gold Ornaments in British Museum, *see* British Museum.

Treasury and Subordinate Departments
Vote for, *June 22*, 795—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [York, W.R., Elland]
Dublin Electric Lighting Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 1078, 1079.
Luggage, Excess Charges—Board of Trade regulating Charges, *June 18*, 289.
Pauper Children
  Boarding out—Number of Boards of Guardians boarding out Children, *June 18*, 291.
  Number of Boards of Guardians sending Children to Public Elementary Schools, *June 18*, 291.

Tripoli
Agricultural and other Natural Resources —Report Presented, *June 21*, 576.
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Tritton, Mr. C. E. [Lambeth, Norwood]
Business of the House
  Appropriation of Private Members' Days — Liquor Licensing Laws Legislation, etc., *June 18*, 323.

Trustee Savings Banks
Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks—Profit and Loss to the Treasury
  Q. Sir E. Vincent; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *June 19*, 445.
Regulations—Consulting Inspection Committee
  Q. Mr. Warr; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *June 28*, 1335.
Return Ordered, *June 15*, 139—Return Presented, *June 22*, 775.

Trusts Funds Bill
Petition, *June 26*, 1113.

Tuke, Sir John [Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities]
Midwives Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1258.

Tunny Nets
Malta—Imposition of Special Tax by Governor of Malta, alleged
  Q. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *June 15*, 150.

Turkey
Consular Establishments, Reduction of, in Asiatic Turkey
  Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 211.
  Tiflis
    Os. Mr. Elliott, Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 243.
Fleet, Reconstruction of—Contract given to German Firm in consequence of Political Pressure, alleged
  Q. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 21*, 626.
Russia and Turkey—Railway Concessions in Asia Minor
  O. Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 243; *Qs.* Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 21*, 627; *June 25*, 906.

Turkey—*cont.*
Trade Reports Presented, *June 18*, 254, 256; *June 26*, 1029.

Tweedmouth, Lord
Military Lands Bill, *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1292, 1295.

Tydd St. Mary Charity
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 22*, 824.

Tyne
Defence of
  O. Mr. Allan, *June 19*, 499.

Uganda
Native Troops, Removal to Somaliland
  Os. Sir B. Gurdon, Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 245.
Report, Delay in Issuing—Illness of Sir H. Johnstone
  Os. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 244.
Vote for, *June 15*, 244—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles.)

Uganda Railway Bill.
l. 2R. *June 21*, 583.
  *Com.** and *Rep.** and 3R.* *June 22*, 741.
  Royal Assent, *June 25*, 873.

Uganda Railway Bill
Debate on Second Reading (Lords), *June 21*, 583.
  Comparison with other Railways, 585, 587.
  Cost of Materials, etc., 585, 587.
  Difficulties of Construction, 585, 587.
    Lions, 587, 588.
    Mau Escarpment, 586.
  Labour, 585.
  Molesworth's, Sir G., Report, 584.
  Reasons for Constructing, 584, 586.
  Survey, 584, 586, 588.

Ulster
Poor Rate Collectors—Refusal to accept part-payment of Rate
  Q. Mr. Archdale; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 28*, 1343.

Underfed Children
Gorst's, Sir J., Statement, *June 14*, 30.

Underground Telegraph Wires
see Telegraph Wires.

Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment Bill
l. 2R., *June 25*, 880.

United States
Shipping and Shipbuilding on the American Lakes—Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.
Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254; *June 28*, 1267.

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877
Statutes Presented, *June 18*, 258, 276.

Universities and Colleges, Great Britain
Vote for, *June 15*, 190—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* names of Colleges.)

Urban District Councils Bill
c. 1R.* *June 26*, 1139.

Usury
Money-lending Bill, *see* that title.

Vagrants' Children Protection Bill
Petitions, *June 19*, 431 ; *June 25*, 894.

Vale of Rheidol Light Railway Bill
l. Rep. * *June 26*, 1026.

Van
British Consul and the Vice-Consulateship at Bitlis
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 211.

Vehicle Lights
Side Lights on Covered Vans Regulations
Q. Gen. Russell ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 18*, 292.

Venezuela
Trade Report Presented, *June 28*, 1267.

Veterinary Department
see Army.

Victoria Station
Penny-in-the-Slot Machines, Defrauding Public
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 28*, 1336.

Victoria University
Government Grant-in-aid — Insufficient Grant, etc.
O. Sir F. S. Powell, *June 15*, 194.

Victoria and Albert Museum
Organisation of the Department
O. Lord Balcarres, *June 15*, 174.

Vincent, Sir E. [Exeter]
Post Office Savings Banks—Deposit Accounts, *June 19*, 444.

Vincent, Sir H. [Sheffield, Central]
Aldershot Manœuvres, Heat Casualties—Adoption of Slouch Cap, *June 15*, 147.
Army Horses—Horses sent out to South Africa, etc., *June 19*, 461, 469.
Cadet Corps and Rifle Clubs—Formation of Special Department, proposed, *June 26*, 1124.
East India Railway Company, Contract with German Firm—Employment of British Shipping, *June 18*, 288.
Foreign Goods, Importation of, with British Marks, *June 25*, 910.

Vincent, Sir H.—*cont.*
Rifle Ranges—Compulsory Acquisition of Sites, Consultative Committee, etc., *June 26*, 1123.
South African War
Colonial Contingents—Proposed Visit of Representatives to England, *June 22*, 775.
Enteric Fever—Inoculation of Troops, *June 26*, 1117.
Trustee and Post Office Savings Banks—Profit and Loss to the Treasury, *June 19*, 445.
Volunteers
Composite Regiments, Formation of proposed, *June 28*, 1327.
Medical Officers' Pay and Allowances in Camps, *June 28*, 1327.

Vivisection
Number of Painful and Painless Experiments in 1899—Address for Return, *June 15*, 136—Return Presented, *June 18*, 275.
Petitions, *June 20*, 515 ; *June 21*, 613.

Voluntary Schools
Associations Constituted under Act of 1897, Associated Schools, Amounts of Aid Grant, etc.—Return Presented, *June 15*, 138 ; *June 18*, 255 ; *June 19*, 413.
Audit of Accounts, etc.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 15*, 164 ; Sir J. Gorst, 172.
Elementary Education Bill, *June 21*, 669, 672, 677, 679, 680.
Petition for Alteration of Law, *June 14*, 4.
Religious Instruction—Ritualistic Practices, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 14*, 47.
Rent Charged in respect of Buildings—Buildings erected by Educational Trust, etc.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 15*, 165 ; Mr. Yoxall, 166 ; Sir J. Gorst, 171.

Volunteers
Annual Return Presented, *June 14*, 7 ; *June 18*, 255.
Camps
Dockyard Employees in Devonshire Regiment—Civil Pay during Training
Q. Capt. Norton ; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *June 25*, 901.
Employers Granting Facilities for fourteen days' Training—Emergency Scheme for one year only
Q. Mr. Boscawen ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 148.
Medical Officers, Payment of—Limiting to one Officer for each Corps
Q. Mr. Billson ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 624 ; *Q.* Sir H. Vincent ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1327.

[*cont.*

Volunteers—*cont.*
Camps—*cont.*
Officers' Command Pay—Deducting from Acting Staff Pay
Q. Mr. L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 618.
Pay
Special Grant for fourteen days' Training, 50 per cent. Conditions—Formation of Composite Regiments, proposed
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1327.
Weekly Payments proposed, Leave of Government Employees, etc.
Q. Mr. Boscawen; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 148.
Postmen—Granting Leave on Full Pay to Assistant Postmen, proposed
Q. Col. Dalbiac; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *June 21*, 622.
Salisbury Plain Manœuvres, *see* that title.
Chaplains—Capitation Grant, etc.
Q. Sir B. Simeon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25* 901.
Manchester Volunteers, *see* Salisbury Plain.
Mobilisation for Home Defence
Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 437.
Mounted Infantry — Capitation Grant, Rate of Camp Allowance, etc.
Q. Mr. Boscawen; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 149; *Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 22*, 778.
Officers' Sons, Education of—Fees at Sandhurst and Woolwich
Q. Sir J. Woodhouse; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1123.
Orderly Room Sergeant Holding Rank of Quartermaster Sergeant — Camp Pay, etc.
Q. Mr. Price; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1126.
Outfit Allowances
Officers Gazetted to Commissions in the Army — Refunding Outfit Allowance
Qs. Col. Dalbiac, Col. Pryce-Jones; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1326.
Reserve of Officers, etc.
Q. Col. Pryce-Jones; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 901.
Rifle Ranges, *see* that title.
Salisbury Plain Manœuvres, *see* that title.
South African War—Duke of Edinburgh's Volunteer Rifles—Mr. Logan's Gift of Maxim Gun and alleged Message
Q. Sir W. Lawson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 899.
Wiltshire Volunteers, *see* that title.

Volunteers Bill
l. Com. June 21, 577.
Rep. June 26*, 1031.
Re-committee, *June 28*, 1279.
Debate in Committee (Lords), *June 28*, 1279.
Condition of calling out, 1283.
Liability for Foreign Service, 1280, 1281, 1283, 1284.

Wagons
Army—Lighter Wagons, Supply of from New Zealand, etc.
Os. Mr. Warner, Mr. Wyndham, *June 19*, 461, 468.

Waima Incident
Progress of Negotiations — Laying Despatch of March 29 on the Table
Qs. Mr. Bill, Mr. Hedderwick; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 28*, 1334.

Wakefield Corporation Market Bill
l. 3R.* *June 19*, 411.

Wales
Cardiff Treasure Trove, Offer of, for Purchase to British Museum, etc.
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 19*, 448.
Census, Papers containing Language Column, etc.
O. Mr. H. Lewis, *June 22*, 840.
Foreshore Leases, etc.
O. Mr. H. Lewis, *June 22*, 863.
Intermediate Education—Vote for, *June 15*, 190.
Machynlleth Rifle Range, Completion of
Q. Col. Pryce-Jones; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 624.
Museum Grants—Welsh Grievance
Os. Mr. H. Lewis, *June 15*, 160; Sir J. Gorst, 169.
North Wales Lunatic Asylum—Purchase of Mineral Rights, Excessive Charge, etc.
Os. Mr. H. Lewis, Mr. Hanbury, *June 22*, 846, 857.
Re-afforesting by Woods and Forests Department
O. Mr. H. Lewis, *June 22*, 847.

Wallace Collection
Vote for, *June 15*, 190.

Walsall Corporation Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 18*, 251.
3R.* *June 22*, 738.
c. 1R.* *June 22*, 770.

Walsh, P.
Under-age Recruit—Refusing to Discharge
Qs. Capt. Donelan, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 28*, 1327.

Walsingham Petty Sessions
Spinks, W.—Case of
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1134.

Walton, Mr. J. [York, W.R., Barnsley]
- China—Anti-Foreign Rising
  - British Gunboats on the Yang-tsze, *June 14*, 11; *June 26*, 1121.
  - Neu-Chwang—Protection of British Life and Property, *June 26*, 1121.

Walton, Mr. J. L. [Leeds, S.]
- Companies Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1159, 1181, 1183.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 942, 963.
- Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1190, 1196.

Wandsworth and Putney Gas Bill
- *c. Con.* June 14*, 3.
  - 3R.* *June 18*, 269.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 18*, 252.
  - 2R.* *June 26*, 1027.
- Standing Orders, *June 22*, 737.

War Medals, *see* Medals.

War Office
- *Secretary of State*—Marquess of Lansdowne.
- *Under Secretary*—Mr. G. Wyndham.
- *Financial Secretary*—Mr. J. P. Williams.
- Casualty Lists—Attendance of Responsible Officer at an early hour in the day
  - *Q.* Mr. Bartley; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 435.
- (*see* Army.)

War Relief Funds Committee
- Recommendations—Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Kearley; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 15*, 280; *June 28*, 1319.

Warlike and Other Stores
- Vote for, *June 19*, 493—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Warned Elementary Schools
- Return Presented, *June 19*, 431.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Stafford, Lichfield]
- Army
  - Headdress — Aldershot Casualties, etc., *June 19*, 488.
  - Horses—Supply of Remounts, etc., *June 19*, 460, 472.
  - Huts—Item omitted from Vote, *June 19*, 499.
  - Militia
    - Adjutants' Training Allowances, *June 18*, 285.
    - Clothing Militiamen in old cast-off Clothing, *June 19*, 488.
  - Rifles, Supply of, etc., *June 19*, 493.
  - Royal Reserve Battalions
    - Delay in issuing Rifles, *June 18*, 282.
    - Horses, Supply of, *June 19*, 468.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T.—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Wagons — Lighter Wagons, Supply from New Zealand, etc., *June 19*, 461.
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 930.
- Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 552.

Warr, Mr. A. F. [Liverpool, E. Toxeth]
- Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1232, 1240.
- Money-lending Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 702.
- Trustee Savings Banks Regulations—Consulting Inspection Committee, *June 28*, 1335.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
- Enteric Fever, Inoculation against in South Africa—Results, *June 26*, 1116.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee, *June 19*, 410.
  - *Com.* June 22*, 739.
  - *Rep.* June 25*, 877.
  - 3R.* *June 26*, 1028.
- Memorandum Presented, *June 27*, 1208.

Water Supply
- Bills relating to, *see* their titles.
- Ireland—New Quay, Condition of Water
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *June 25*, 916.
- Metropolitan Water Supply—Royal Commission, Minutes of Evidence Presented, *June 14*, 7; *June 18*, 254.

Water Supply Bill
- *c.* Bill Withdrawn, *June 26*, 1204.

Water-tube Boilers
- Naval Ships, *see* Navy—Boilers.

Webster, Sir R.
- *see* Alverstone of Alverstone, Baron.

Wedderburn, Sir W. [Banffshire]
- India
  - Budget—Date of Introduction, *June 21*, 626.
  - Famine
    - Advances to Native States, *June 19*, 439.
    - Imperial Grant proposed, Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, Memorial, etc., *June 15*, 156.
  - Finance
    - Apportionment of Charge between India and the Imperial Exchequer, *June 21*, 624.
    - Financial Statement — Explanatory Memorandum, *June 21*, 625.

Weights and Measures
  Milk—Use of Barn Gallon, etc.
    O. Mr. Loyd, *June 22*, 816.

Welby, Col. A. C. E. [Taunton]
  Aldershot — Heat Casualties during Manœuvres, Defective Headgear, etc., *June 19*, 481.
  Aides-de-camp to Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Regimental Training, *June 28*, 1325.
  Horses—Supply of Remounts, etc., *June 19*, 454.
  Hussars, 8th — Absence of Officers on Special Duty, *June 22*, 779.
  Meat, Inspection of, etc., *June 19*, 479.
  Piershill Barracks, Insanitary Condition, etc., *June 19*, 501.

Welby, Sir C. [Notts, Newark]
  Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 564.

Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill
  l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 25*, 876.

Welsh Sunday Closing Bill
  Passing into Law this Session
    Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 297.

Wemyss, Earl of
  Military Lands Bill, *Rep.*, *June 28*, 1292.
  Militia Ballot Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 878.

West Bromwich Corporation Bill
  *c. Con.** and 3R.* *June 19*, 421.
  l. 1R.* *June 19*, 411.
    2R.* *June 26*, 1026.
  Attorney General's Report Presented, *June 28*, 1265.
  Standing Orders, *June 22*, 874.

West Ham Corporation Bill
  c. Report from Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills, *June 21*, 606.
    *Con.** and 3R.* *June 27*, 1205.
  l. 1R.* *June 28*, 1266.

West Indies
  Increased Duties on British Goods
    O. Sir C. Dilke, *June 15*, 245.
  Jamaica, *see* that title.

West Kent Regiment
  Rangoon, Outrage by British Soldiers, *see* Rangoon.

Western Australia
  see Australasia.

Westgate and Birchington Water Bill
  c. 2R.* *June 25*, 890.
  Standing Orders, *June 18*, 267.

Whale, Colonel
  Peckham Roman Catholic Procession—Attack on
    Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *June 18*, 293.

Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. L. [Yorks, Ripon]
  Rabies, Stamping out, *June 22*, 820.

Whisky in Bond
  Scotland—Return Ordered, *June 19*, 432.

White's, Sir G., Despatches
  Publication of
    Q. Mr. Lafone; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 15*, 141.

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill
  c. 2R.* *June 15*, 131.
    *Rep.** *June 22*, 768.

Whitmore, Mr. C. A. [Chelsea]
  Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 25*, 929, 933, 1004.

Widnes and Runcorn Bridge Bill
  *l. Rep.** *June 18*, 251.

Wild Animals
  Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill, *see* that title.

Williams, Mr. J. C. [Notts., Mansfield]
  Burial Grounds Bill, *Con.*, *June 18*, 390, 396, 399.
  Charity Commissioners' Schemes, *June 22*, 831.
  Education—Religious Instruction, Ritualistic Practices, etc., *June 15*, 161.
  Voluntary Schools, Payment of Rent out of Public Funds, Right of Management, etc., *June 15*, 178.

Williams, Mr. J. P.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Birmingham, S.]
  Engineers and Artillery Promotion Regulations, *June 19*, 436.
  Home Defence—Organisation of the Land Forces, etc., *June 19*, 437.
  Militia
    Army Commissions — Competitive Examinations, *June 19*, 438.
    Officers
      Leave of Absence, *June 19*, 438.
      Line Officers — Stoppage of Retired Pay on Embodiment, *June 19*, 502.
  Piershill Barracks—Sanitary Condition, etc., *June 19*, 500.
  Rifle Ranges—Colchester Camp Rifle Range, *June 19*, 439.
  St. George's Barracks and the National Gallery—Erection of Barracks in Millbank, etc., *June 19*, 500.

[*cont.*

Williams, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
South African War
British Forces—Number landed in South Africa, *June 19*, 434.
Casualty Lists at the War Office—Attendance of Responsible Officer at an early hour in the day, *June 19*, 435.
Field Service Equipment, Loss of—Compensation, *June 19*, 434.
Lindley—Disaster to Imperial Yeomanry, etc., *June 19*, 433.
Martial Law Statistics, *June 19*, 435.
Parcels—Non-delivery of Christmas Presents, *June 19*, 436.
Telegrams—Code and Cypher Commercial Telegrams, Removal of Restrictions, *June 19*, 436.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Army—Lancers, Reserve Regiment, at Ballincollig, alleged want of Equipment, *June 28*, 1325.

Willox, Sir J. [Liverpool, Everton]
Liverpool Census Returns, alleged inaccuracy, *June 21*, 633.

Wilson, Mr. C. H. [Hull, W.]
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, *Con.*, *June 27*, 1251.

Wilson, Mr. F. W. [Norfolk, Mid]
Colchester Camp Rifle Range—Opening, *June 19*, 438.
Rifle Clubs—Granting Rounds of Ammunition on favourable terms, *June 19*, 494.

Wilson, Mr. J. [Durham, Mid]
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Con.*, *June 20*, 559, 563, 570.

Wilson, Mr. J. [Falkirk Burghs]
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, 3R., *June 27*, 1225.

Wiltshire Volunteers
King, Serjeant J.—Dismissal
Qs. Lord E. Fitzmaurice, Dr. Farquharson; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 617.
Rifles—Delay in issuing
Q. Mr. Goulding; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 18*, 281.

Winchester, Bishop of
Burial Grounds Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1049.
Marriage Act Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *June 26*, 1054.

Winchester, Marquess of
Sat First in Parliament after the death of his brother, *June 18*, 249.

Wirral Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *June 14*, 3.
*Rep.** *June 22*, 768.

Withington Urban District Council Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 18*, 253.
Reported with Amendts.* *June 19*, 410.
3R.* *June 25*, 876.
c. 1R.* *June* 25, 892.

Wolverhampton Gas Bill
l. 2R.* *June 19*, 410.
*Rep.** *June 25*, 875.

Wolverhampton, Essington, and Cannock Chase Junction Railway Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *June 25*, 876.

Woodbridge District Water Bill
l. *Rep.** *June 25*, 875.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
Volunteer Officers' Sons, Education of—Fees at Sandhurst and Woolwich, *June 26*, 1123.

Woodlands
Rating of Woodlands—Petition, *June 21*, 608.

Woods, Mr. S. [Essex, Walthamstow]
Land Revenue Record Office—Public Inspection of Records, *June 19*, 446.
London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway Act, 1894—Delay in Completion of Railway, etc., *June 14*, 14.
Workmen's Compensation Act—Medical Examinations, *June 21*, 631.

Woods and Forest and Land Revenues of the Crown
Vote for, *June 22*, 845—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles).

Woolwich
Hospital—Case of Private Mitchell
Qs. Sir E. Gourley, Mr. Marks; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 21*, 616.
Royal Military College Fees — Auxiliary Officers' Sons
Q. Sir J. Woodhouse; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 26*, 1123.

Workington Railways and Docks Bill
Witnesses Ordered to attend Select Committee, *June 18*, 249.

Workmen's Compensation Act
- Army and Navy Services — Number of Men Receiving Compensation, Amount of Compensation, etc. — Address for Return, *June 14*, 10.
- Committal for Non-payment of Award, Judge's Decision—Bailey *v.* Plant
  - *Q.* Mr. M'Kenna; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 26*, 1133.
- Extension to Naval and Military Servants
  - *Q.* Mr. M'Kenna; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 18*, 279; *Q.* Col. Pryce-Jones; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 25*, 920.
- Medical Examinations—Clause 11
  - *Q.* Mr. Woods; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 21*, 631.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill
- *c. Con.*, *June 20*, 525.
- 3R., *June 27*, 1209.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill
- Debate on Consideration and Third Reading, *June 20*, 525; *June 27*, 1209.
  - Accidents, Sources of, etc., 533, 535, 539, 568.
  - Act of 1897, Working of, etc., 525 529, 536, 537, 543, 570.
  - Agricultural Labourers excluded from the Bill, 525, 526, 530, 536, 538, 540, 546, 550, 552, 553.
  - Casual employment, 525, 530, 532, 537, 551, 569, 570, 1210, 1214, 1218, 1222, 1224.
  - Compensation—Central Fund, State Aid, etc., 537, 541, 1212, 1213, 1216, 1219.
  - Consolidation of Compensation Laws, 1211, 1218.
  - Contractors, 550, 561, 563.
  - "Employment for hire," 557, 558, 559, 560.
  - Habitual employment, 525, 537, 541, 557, 565, 1210, 1214, 1218, 1222, 1224.
  - "Habitually," Introduction of in the wording of the Bill, 525, 530, 531, 536, 538, 541, 547, 550, 552, 554, 560.
  - Information as to the provisions of the Act, Circulating, 1217, 1225.
  - Insurance, terms, etc., 530, 532, 533, 552, 565, 1209, 1216, 1218, 1221, 1225.
  - "Labourer," Definition of, 544, 565.
  - Liability for Compensation — Occupier, Owner, and Employer, 526, 528, 533, 537, 540, 547, 549, 551.
  - Livery Stable Keepers, etc., Bringing under the Bill, 566.
  - Market Gardeners, 567.
  - "Undertaker," Definition of, 541, 548, 549.
  - "Workman," Definition of, 528, 542, 546, 549.

Workmen's Dwellings
- Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, *see* that title.

Workshops
- *see* Factories and Workshops.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart- [Sheffield Hallam]
- Sheffield University College—Grant-in-aid, etc., *June 15*, 210.

Wuhu
- Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 256.

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*Under Secretary of State for War* [Dover]
- Aides-de-camp to Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Regimental Training, *June 28*, 1326.
- Aldershot
  - General in Command, Date of Appointment, *June 21*, 624.
  - Government Railway Siding—Erection of Roof, *June 25*, 902.
  - Heat Casualties during Manœuvres, *June 19*, 483.
    - Authority Responsible for, etc., *June 19*, 492.
    - Food Rations, *June 28*, 1325.
    - Hospital Stoppages, etc., *June 18*, 623.
    - Inquiry, *June 14*, 11.
      - Report of Inquiry, *June 22*, 778.
    - Number of Cases in Hospital, *June 26*, 1125.
    - Responsibility and Penalties, *June 21*, 623.
    - Return March—Number of Casualties during, *June 28*, 1324.
    - Statement, *June 15*, 144; *June 18*, 282.
- Ambulance Wagons, *June 19*, 495.
- Armaments and Equipment—Standard of Reserve, etc., *June 19*, 497.
- Artillery and Engineer Lieutenants—Promotion Regulations, *June 22*, 780.
- Barracks—Cubicles, Lighting of Barrack Rooms, etc., *June 19*, 499.
- Boer War, 1881—Issue of Medals, proposed, *June 28*, 1322.
- Cadet Corps and Rifle Clubs—Formation of Special Department, proposed, *June 26*, 1124.
- Dogs, Training for Outpost Duty, proposed—Employment of Dogs in Continental Armies, *June 18*, 281.
- Enlistment and Recruiting
  - Recruits for Army and Militia—Percentage Enlisted in Ireland, *June 25*, 902.
  - Under-age Recruits, Discharge of
    - Dundass, D., Case of, *June 25*, 903.
    - Walsh, P., Case of, *June 28*, 1328.

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Esquimalt and Wei-hai-wei Garrisons—Provisions in the Estimates, *June 19*, 499.
Forage, Inspection, etc., *June 19*, 477.
Guns—New Field Guns, etc., *June 19*, 495.
Headdress — Unsuitability of Forage Cap, Sentimental Traditions Regarding Headgear, etc., *June 19*, 483.
Horses—Supply of Remounts, Horses sent out to South Africa, etc., *June 19*, 457, 468.
Huts for South Africa and Home Service, *June 19*, 499.
Lancers — Reserve Regiment at Ballincollig, want of Equipment, *June 28*, 1325.
Medals—Forwarding Deceased Officers' Medals to Relatives, *June 21*, 620.
Militia
  Adjutants and Quartermasters' Training Allowances—Additional Grant-in-aid, *June 18*, 285.
  Army Commissions, Seniority of University Candidates, *June 22*, 780, 781.
  Clothing Militiamen in Cast-off Clothing, *June 19*, 492.
  Senior Major's Pay, *June 22*, 780.
Nursing Sisters' Pensions, *June 22*, 777.
Officers
  Cost of Living in the Army—Extravagance of Officers, etc., Explanation, *June 19*, 470.
  Half-pay Officers—Outfit Allowance, *June 25*, 901.
  Reserve of Officers—Officers of Volunteer Corps, Outfit Allowance on rejoining Regular Army, *June 25*, 901.
  Special Duty, Officers absent on—Replacing, *June 22*, 779.
Provisions, Forage, etc.—Amount of Rations, Canteen System, etc., *June 19*, 476.
Reserve Squadrons in Ireland—Pay of Quartermasters and Adjutants, *June 26*, 1125.
Rifle Clubs — Supply of Rifles and Ammunition, etc., *June 19*, 495.
Rifle Ranges
  Compulsory Acquisition of Sites—Consultative Committee, *June 26*, 1124.
  Machynlleth Rifle Range, Completion of, *June 21*, 624.
Rifles—Delay in issuing to Volunteers and Royal Reserve Battalions, *June 18*, 282.
Royal Reserve Battalions—Good Conduct Badges and Rate of Pay, etc., *June 26*, 1126.

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Salisbury Plain Manœuvres
  Canteen Arrangements—Restricting to Army Contractors, *June 21*, 622.
  Manchester Volunteers — Commissariat Breakdown, *June 21*, 621, 622.
South African War
  Brigade Signalling Officers—Increase of Pay, proposed, *June 21*, 620.
  Casualties, Sherwood Foresters Militia—Delay in publishing List, *June 18*, 278.
  Colonial Contingents
    Proposed Visit of Representatives to England, *June 22*, 776.
    Total Number landed in South Africa, etc., *June 28*, 1320.
  Duke of Edinburgh's Volunteer Rifles—Mr. Logan's Gift of a Maxim Gun, and alleged Message, *June 25*, 900.
  Enteric Fever, Inoculation against—Statistics and Results, *June 26*, 1117; *June 28*, 1322.
  Farquhar's Farm Engagement — Field-State of 60th Rifles, *June 18*, 279.
  Hospital Accommodation for Invalided Soldiers returning home—Case of Private Mitchell, *June 21*, 616.
  Hospital Arrangements at Bloemfontein, Mr. Burdett-Coutts's Charges—Letters to *The Times* previous to May 29, Communicating to the War Office, *June 28*, 1314, 1315.
  Invalided Soldiers incapable of earning Livelihood, Provision for—Extension of Powers of Chelsea Commissioners, *June 18*, 281.
  Ladysmith, Siege of
    Disappearance of Stores from the Hospital, *June 15*, 140.
    Imperial Government's claim on Mayor for Food supplied from Military Stores, *June 18*, 278.
    White's, Gen. Sir G., Despatches—Publication of, *June 15*, 141.
  Lindley—Disaster to Imperial Yeomanry, Casualty List, *June 25*, 899.
  Martial Law Administration
    Colonial Office Circular in 1867—Administration based on, *June 26*, 1116.
    Fenians under Arrest at Mafeking, alleged, *June 25*, 898.
  Outrages on Boer Women and Children by British Troops—Boer Allegations, *June 15*, 142.
  Prisoners, British, Release of
    Court of Inquiry into Circumstances leading to Surrender, *June 28*, 1320.
    Publication of Names, *June 22*, 776.

[*cont*

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*cont.*
- South African War—*cont.*
  - Promotions from the Ranks
    - Conditions, *June 21*, 619.
    - Number of men promoted from Ranks of Regular Forces, etc., *June 22*, 776.
  - Reservists
    - Pensions—Counting service in A, B, C, or D sections, etc., *June 22*, 778.
    - Situations kept open—Reservists first soldiers to be sent home on conclusion of Hostilities, *June 22*, 777.
  - Roodeval Engagement—Capture of Derbyshire Militia, *June 28*, 1321.
  - Settlement of Soldiers in South Africa after the War—Grants to Soldiers, *June 22*, 777.
- Veterinary Department—Officers' Titles, etc., *June 26*, 1126.
- Volunteers
  - Camps
    - Chaplains — Capitation Grant, *June 25*, 901.
    - Composite Regiments, Formation of, proposed, *June 28*, 1327.
    - Emergency Scheme for one Year only, *June 15*, 149.
    - Medical Officers, Payment of, etc., *June 21*, 624.
    - Medical Officers' Pay, *June 28*, 1327.
    - Officers' Command Pay, *June 21*, 619.
    - Pay and Allowances—Weekly Payments, proposed, Leave of Government Employees, etc., *June 15*, 148.
  - Mounted Infantry—Capitation Grant, Rate of Camp Allowance, etc., *June 15*, 149; *June 22*, 778.
  - Officers' Outfit Allowance, *June 25*, 901; *June 28*, 1327.
  - Officers' Sons, Education of—Fees at Sandhurst and Woolwich, *June 26*, 1123.
  - Orderly Room Sergeant Holding Rank of Quartermaster Sergeant—Camp Pay, etc., *June 26*, 1126.
  - Wiltshire Volunteers—Dismissal of Sergeant King, *June 21*, 618.
- Yeomanry—Adjutants' Pay Grievance, *June 25*, 900.

Yang-tsze River
- *see* China.

Yeomanry
- Adjutants' Pay—Grievance
  - *Q.* Mr. J. W. Digby; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 25*, 900.

Yeomanry—*cont.*
- Imperial Yeomanry in South Africa—Disaster at Lindley
  - *Qs.* Mr. Butcher, General Russell; *As.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *June 19*, 433.
- Obsolete Arms
  - *O.* Mr. Hardy, *June 19*, 497.

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A. [Chester]
- China
  - Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.—Despatch of Indian Native Troops to Hong Kong, *June 18*, 287.
  - Gunboats on the Yang-tsze, Additional Number, etc., *June 19*, 442.

Yokohama
- Trade Report Presented, *June 18*, 254.

York, Archbishop of
- Burial Grounds Bill, 2R., *June 26*, 1049.

Yorkshire College, Leeds
- Insufficient Grant-in-aid, etc.
  - *O.* Sir F. S. Powell, *June 15*, 195.

Youthful Offenders Bill
- Clauses 3 to 18, Passing into Law this Session—Admission of Irish Children to English and Scotch Reformatories, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *June 25*, 914.

Yoxall, Mr. H. [Nottingham, W.]
- Education
  - Buildings Erected by Educational Trust — Eastbourne Schools, etc., *June 15*, 166.
  - Gorst's, Sir J., Statement, Dismissal of Teachers, Code for 1900, etc., *June 14*, 91.
  - Training Colleges, *June 15*, 167.
  - Superannuation of Teachers, Isle of Man and Channel Islands—Legislation, *June 21*, 630.
- Elementary Education Bill, 2R., *June 21*, 672.
- Local Government Board—Appointment of Assistant Laboratory Clerk, *June 28*, 1340.
- Shorthand in Elementary Schools, *June 28*, 1338.
- South African War—Sherwood Foresters Militia—Casualty List, *June 18*, 278.

Zanzibar
- Church Missionary Stations at Rabais, etc. — Declaration placing Rabais outside Sultan's Dominions, alleged
  - *Q.* Mr. Duckworth; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 15*, 152.
- Slavery—Attitude of Sir A. Hardinge, etc.
  - Debate in Com. of Supply, *June 15*, 216—(*Division: A. 39; N. 94*).

1L